

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS  
313 NORTH FIRST STREET  
ANN ARBOR, MICH.

October 1955



INDIANA  
STATE  
TEACHERS  
COLLEGE

*The Teachers College*  
**JOURNAL**  
NUMBER 1

VOLUME XXVII



TERRE  
HAUTE,  
INDIANA

## CONTENTS

Fourth State-Wide Conference on THE FIFTH YEAR IN TEACHER EDUCATION  
(Sponsored by the Committee on Teacher Education and Professional Standards  
of the Indiana State Teachers Association and Indiana State Teachers College)

Foreword	Page 1
Edgar M. Tanruther	
Conference Program	Page 2
Conference Objectives	Page 2
Improving Teacher Education	Page 3
Walter W. Cook	
An Analysis of Outcomes of the Conferences on the Fifth Year of Teacher Education	Page 6
Howard T. Batchelder	
A Fifth Year — Why?	Page 7
H. Gordon Hullfish	
Reports of Study Groups	Page 12
Science	
Mathematics	
The Language Arts	
Social Science	
Practical Arts	
Fine Arts	
Foreign Language	
Physical Education	
Elementary Grades	
Conference Summary	Page 17
Walter W. Cook	
Guiding Principles	Page 19
Directory of Participants	Page 20

The Teachers College Journal seeks to present competent discussions of professional problems in education and toward this end restricts its contributing personnel to those of training and experience in the field. The Journal does not engage in re-publication practice, in belief that previously published material, however creditable, has already been made available to the professional public through its original publication.

Manuscripts concerned with controversial issues are welcomed, with the express understanding that all such issues are published without editorial bias or discrimination.

Articles are presented on the authority of their writers, and do not necessarily commit the Journal to points of views so expressed. At all times the Journal reserves the right to refuse publication if in the opinion of the Editorial Board an author has violated standards of professional ethics or journalistic presentation.

Published October, November, December, January, March, and May by Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Entered as second-class matter October 5, 1931, at the post office at Terre Haute, Indiana, under act of August 24, 1912.

### OCTOBER COVER

The October Journal contains the complete report of the Fourth State-Wide Conference on The Fifth Year in Teacher Education held on the Campus of Indiana State Teachers College, July 20-22, 1955. The cover depicts a group of teachers at Indiana State completing their fifth year during the summer 1955.

**RALEIGH W. HOLMSTEDT**  
President

**CHARLES W. HARDAWAY**  
Editor

**ALLAN SPICER**  
Assistant to the Editor

### EDITORIAL ASSOCIATES

Olis G. Jamison

Jacob E. Cobb

Richard E. Thursfield

### EDITORIAL BOARD

Florise Hunsucker

Richard E. Thursfield

Thomas A. Nevitt

Olis G. Jamison

Raleigh W. Holmstedt

Ex-officio

VOL. XXVII

OCTOBER, 1955

NUMBER 1

## THE TEACHERS COLLEGE JOURNAL



## Foreword . . .

The Fourth State-Wide Conference on the Fifth Year in Teacher Education, held on the campus of Indiana State Teachers College, July 20-22, 1955, was sponsored jointly by the host institution and the Committee on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the Indiana State Teachers Association.

Participants at the conference recognized that this would very likely be the last in this series of conferences on the fifth year; and they approached the many problems confronting them with a determination to develop suggestions and guiding principles which would be helpful to those interested in the improvement of the fifth year program. Their deliberations are contained in this report. Members of the conference benefited from the reports of previous conferences on the fifth year problem.

A study of the conference personnel as listed at the end of this report will reveal the wide diversity of interests of those in attendance. The cooperative efforts of many individuals from different fields of endeavor has contributed much to the understanding of the many problems related to the fifth year program, and should result in the solution of many of them.

Indiana State Teachers College and the Committee on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the Indiana State Teachers Association wish to thank the many persons who helped make this conference a success. These persons include classroom teachers, college administrators, representatives of subject-matter departments in colleges and universities, public school administrators, representatives of the State Department of Public Instruction

and the Teacher Training and Licensing Commission, specialists in teacher education, county superintendents, representatives of the Indiana Congress of Parents and Teachers, and representatives of the Indiana School Boards Association. Special thanks should go to the excellent speakers who also acted as consultants to the various discussion groups and to group leaders and recorders.

It is our hope that the proceedings of this conference will be helpful to those who were present and contributed to the success of the conference, and to others who are working toward the improvement of teacher education.

Edgar M. Tanruther, Chairman  
Steering Committee of the  
Conference



## CONFERENCE OBJECTIVES

1. To further define the purposes of a fifth year in teacher education for elementary and secondary school teachers.
2. To further examine the basic issues involved in the improvement of the curriculum for the fifth year in teacher education.
3. To clarify the needs of teachers for additional work during the fifth year in instructional areas, related fields, and professional education.
4. To suggest policies and procedures by which colleges and universities may improve the fifth year in teacher education.
5. To consider the implications of the deliberations of this and previous conferences for teacher certification in Indiana.

## STEERING COMMITTEE FOR THE CONFERENCE

Howard T. Batchelder, Asst. Dean School of Education Indiana University	Borden R. Purcell Director of Prof. Relations Indiana State Teachers Assoc.
Kenneth Black Assistant Business Manager Indiana State Teachers College	Clarence E. Robbins Superintendent of Schools Plainfield, Indiana
John Erle Grinnel Dean of Instruction Indiana State Teachers College	Donald M. Sharpe, Director Secondary Professional Laboratory Experiences Indiana State Teachers College
Olis G. Jamison Education Department Indiana State Teachers College	Walter O. Shriner, Head Department of Mathematics Indiana State Teachers College
Earl A. Johnson, Head Department of Education Ball State Teachers College	Edgar M. Tanruther, Director Elementary Professional Laboratory Experiences Indiana State Teachers College and Chairman of the Steering Committee of the Conference
B. C. Lawson, Executive Asst. Division of Education Purdue University	

## CONFERENCE SPEAKERS

Walter W. Cook Dean, College of Education University of Minnesota	H. Gordon Hullfish Professor of Education Ohio State University
---	---

## PROGRAM

Conference Chairman.....Olis G. Jamison, Chairman,  
Education Department, Indiana State Teachers College  
Consultants..Dr. Walter W. Cook, Dean, College of Education  
University of Minnesota  
Dr. H. Gordon Hullfish, Professor of Education  
Ohio State University

### WEDNESDAY, JULY 20, 1955

9:30-12:00 N	Registration and Coffee Hour .... Student Union Building, Second Floor
12:00 N	Luncheon ..... Women's Residence Hall
1:15 p.m.	First General Session .... Student Union Lounge Presiding ..... Olis G. Jamison Greetings ..... Raleigh W. Holmstedt, President Indiana State Teachers College Plans for the Conference ..... Olis G. Jamison Keynote Address ..... Walter W. Cook
2:45 p.m.	Break
3:00 p.m.	An Analysis of the Accomplishment of the Confer- ences on Fifth Year Held at Ball State Teachers College, Purdue, and Indiana; Howard T. Batchelder

3:30 p.m.

Meeting of Study Groups, Language and Mathe-  
matics Building

Group I. Science Room 8  
R. M. Whaley, Leader; Merrill C. Carr, Recorder

Group II. Mathematics Room 5  
M. W. Keller, Leader; Dana B. Schwanholt, Re-  
corder

Group III. Language Arts Room 3  
Paul Royalty, Leader; Mary E. Ohm, Recorder

Group IV. Social Science Room 4  
Shirley H. Engle, Leader; Helen Ederle, Recorder

Group V. Practical Arts Room 108  
Anne Lee, Leader; Glade E. Rohrer, Recorder

Group VI. Fine Arts Room 106  
Arthur D. Hill, Leader; Kathryn Everman, Re-  
corder

Group VII. Foreign Language Room 105  
Norman Pratt, Leader; C. E. Aldrich, Recorder

Group VIII. Physical Education Room 101  
Gavin Walker, Leader; Virgil E. Schooler, Re-  
corder

Group IX. Elementary Grades Room 7  
Earl Johnson, Leader; Bernadine C. Nonte, Re-  
corder

4:30 p.m.

Meeting of Steering Committee, all group  
leaders, and recorders .... Student Union Lounge

6:30 p.m.

Banquet ..... Women's Residence Hall  
Presiding ..... Robert H. Wyatt  
Address ..... H. Gordon Hullfish

### THURSDAY, JULY 21, 1955

8:00-8:30 a.m.	Breakfast (self-service) .. Women's Residence Hall
9:00 a.m.	General Session ..... Student Union Lounge Presiding ..... Olis G. Jamison
9:15 a.m.	Meeting of Study Groups
12:00 N	Luncheon ..... Women's Residence Hall
1:30 p.m.	General Session ..... Student Union Lounge Presiding ..... Olis G. Jamison Progress Reports of Study Groups
2:15 p.m.	Meeting of Study Groups
4:30 p.m.	Meeting of Steering Committee, all group leaders, and recorders .... Student Union Lounge
6:00 p.m.	Dinner ..... Women's Residence Hall Free Evening (No meetings scheduled)

### FRIDAY, JULY 22, 1955

8:00-8:30 a.m.	Breakfast (self-service) .. Women's Residence Hall
9:00 a.m.	Meeting of Study Groups
10:45 a.m.	General Session ..... Student Union Lounge Presiding ..... Olis G. Jamison Final Reports of Study Groups
12:15 p.m.	Luncheon ..... Women's Residence Hall Presiding ..... Olis G. Jamison Summary of Conference ..... Walter W. Cook Next Steps Adjournment of Conference



# Improving Teacher Education

WALTER W. COOK

Several times over the past few years, I have been asked to speak on the topic "Improving The Fifth Year In Teacher Education". Until now I have always declined, feeling that I did not have a significant contribution to make. I still feel that way and approach the problem with humility. Indiana is known throughout the nation as one of the states requiring five years of college preparation for a standard teaching certificate. Certainly you have not accepted this obligation lightly since this meeting is the fourth state-wide conference on the fifth year in teacher education.

For the past twenty-five years, the University of Minnesota has been concerned with two types of fifth-year programs in teacher education. One program is called a five-year professional program in teacher education, leading to the master of education degree, entirely under the control of the College of Education. In this program the fifth year is not considered graduate work any more than the fifth year in the professional courses in engineering, dentistry, law, and medicine are considered graduate work. It is simply a five-year sequence of courses in a professional school preparing for teaching.

The other program, of course, is the fifth year in the Graduate School, leading to an M.A. or M.S. degree. This program is administered entirely by the Graduate School, the policies of which are established by all the departments of the University. From the standpoint of the established graduate schools of the country, the fifth year of teacher education when administered by a college, should be considered a professional sequence and not a graduate program. I doubt that this fact makes a great deal of difference to us here in considering our problems of improving the fifth year in teacher education.

Personally, I have felt that the last year in any teacher education program should take place after the student has had one or more years of teaching experience, that it would be a mistake to require five years of preparation before permitting the candidate to accept a teaching position. My reasons are as follows: First, professional courses in teacher education mean a great deal more to the students after they have had teaching experience. Second, if we were to require five years of teacher preparation before teaching, one of these years must be strongly weighted with "practicum courses". Since such courses are the most expensive courses we offer, it would require a considerable additional expenditure by the teachers colleges. My third reason is that requiring five years of preparation before

actual teaching, costs the student an additional year of training without salary. Hence, the fifth year of such a program as this is much more expensive to the institution and to the student; and, furthermore, the professional courses are much less effective before the teacher has had actual experience. An additional reason is that a significant percentage of our certified graduates never teach. A fifth year would involve additional wasted effort for this group. The Indiana plan is, therefore, to my liking. It enables the teacher to begin teaching at the end of the fourth year and gives him an adequate number of years in which the additional year may be completed before a permanent teaching license is granted. The problem of this conference is to make the additional year of training, after experience has been gained, the most effective possible.

There are at least three ways to improve a teacher education program. One is to improve the quality of those accepted for the program, that is, select only those students for teacher education who have the intellectual competencies, the communication skills, the physical stamina, and the personality characteristics which give them high potential for teaching competency. The second procedure in improving teacher education is to improve the quality of the faculty, that is, insure that those who are selected for the training of teachers are master teachers, have sustaining intellectual interests; and the personality qualities essential to imparting a glow of enthusiasm for self-improvement to others. The third method of improving a teacher education program is to increase its length. That is what we have done with our fifth-year programs. However, unless our students have been carefully selected and unless our faculties are competent, this fifth year will not improve our program. We like to point to the seven years required for a degree in medicine and the five years required for a degree in engineering, but we should remember that those selected for training in medicine are largely from the upper two percent of the population and those selected for training in engineering are certainly from the upper ten percent. We can defend a fifth year of teacher education only when guaranteed that the potential for improvement is there. I believe that no student should be admitted to a teacher education program until he has spent at least one year in college. If a student wishes to become a candidate for a teaching certificate, during this first year or at any time when this decision is made,

an investigation should be made of the student's intellectual competence and achievement, his health and physical well being, his competencies in the speech and communicative arts, and his personality characteristics. He should be screened with the same thoroughness as students who enter medicine or law. I shall not attempt to say what the standards for admission to a teacher education program should be, but every teacher training institution should have the responsibility for deciding and recording what it thinks the standards should be. Each college might well prepare a definitive statement of the type of person it seeks for training in the various areas of teacher education.

My major concern here at this time will be with an analysis of the personality characteristics which are essential for successful teaching. Since 1941, we at the University of Minnesota have been engaged in research in this area, and we believe that our findings have some value to the teacher training institutions of the country.

There are many ways of describing the inadequate teacher. Most of them unsatisfactory, at least in some respects. We may label them as "emotionally immature", but this term can mean many different things. Its meaning here will become clear as we proceed. We could hardly expect an emotionally immature teacher to develop sound emotional reactions in his students. Emotional immaturity begets emotional immaturity. There are at least two types of teachers who might be described by this term. The first type is the one who demands strict adherence to set rules and thwarts all initiative, originality, and spontaneity. He demands unquestioning submission to his will which crushes the individuality of the child. Instead of being a stabilizing and inspiring influence on the pupils, he constantly increases their emotional problems. Instead of looking upon the teacher as one who can give them confidence and faith and security and hope, the pupils look upon this teacher as a terrifying tyrant. He vents his hostility and emotional needs upon the children. Frequently such teachers are expert oral sadists, capable of inflicting greater pain than would be true if he punished them physically. His chief forms of punishment are unjustified criticisms, biting sarcasm, and the humiliation of the child before his peers, shriveling the child's ego with his superiority.

Another type of emotional immature teacher is the over-sentimental, lovable, "dear child" sort of person, hopelessly sentimental toward children. Nothing the pupils can do or say is ever wrong. It is difficult for him to bring himself to discipline the children in any situation. The children constantly take advantage of his kindness with indefensible types of behavior. The pupils are actually unhappy and resentful that they are

not making progress and are not getting firm guidance and counsel. Both such teachers burden their pupils with emotional problems.

In the beginning of the experimentation such descriptions as I have given above were not taken too seriously. We wished the descriptions to grow out of the experiments as we attempted to get a purely operational definition of the superior and inferior teacher.

Our first problem was to build items, or perhaps they should be described as standard situations to which teachers could respond in the hope that the poor teacher would respond in one way and the good teacher in another. We had no idea what the nature of the discriminating items might be, so our first task was to build as many items as possible. Actually in the first experiment, we built a total of 756 items and placed them in two tryout inventories for the purpose of determining which ones might discriminate between superior and inferior teachers.

The nature of the items were as follows: One group of items dealt with the moral status of children in the opinion of adults, especially as concerns the child's adherence to adult imposed standards, moral or otherwise. An example of this type of item is "Children should be seen and not heard." In asking teachers to respond to this term, we gave them a choice of strongly agreeing, agreeing, questioning, disagreeing, or strongly disagreeing. Thus each item could be marked on a five-point scale. The second type of item dealt with discipline and problems of conduct in the classroom and how the teacher thought such problems should be dealt with. Here is an example: "Pupils found writing notes should be severely punished." The third type of item dealt with principles of child development and behavior related to principles of educational psychology, the level of ability, achievement, learning theory, motivation, and personality development. An example of an item in this category was, "The boastful child is usually over-confident of his ability." The fourth type of item dealt with principles of education related to philosophy, curriculum development, and administration. An example of an item here is, "Pupils should be required to do more studying at home." The fifth type of item dealt with the personal reactions of the teacher, her likes and dislikes, sources of irritation, etc. An example of this item was "Without children, life would be dull." The five types of items listed above has no real significance in the study except to demonstrate the procedure that was followed in attempting to build as many items as possible which might discriminate between good and poor teachers.

After the items were built, the next problem was to determine which ones would

discriminate effectively between superior and inferior teachers. The method followed here was to visit more than seventy schools, each school having 12 or more teachers. Both elementary schools and high schools were visited. As each school was visited by the experimenter, the principal was asked to designate his most effective teacher, the one who had the closest rapport with pupils, who worked well with parents, fellow teachers and the administration, who liked teaching, and whose pupils liked going to school. In other words, the principal designated his best teacher as far as personality adjustment was concerned. The principal was then asked to designate the teacher at the other end of the scale, the one whom he would like to see resign, the one who was in trouble with parents, teachers, pupils, who was a constant trouble-maker in the school and who especially had low rapport with pupils. In a few instances, the principal designated two superior teachers and sometimes two inferior teachers. Over seventy schools were visited before a sample of one hundred superior and one hundred inferior teachers had been designated.

As these teachers were designated, they were visited by the experimenter and asked to participate in an experiment designed to determine what the attitudes of successful teachers are with reference to a great many questions. After the teacher had agreed to participate in the experiment, one-half of the inventory was left to be marked. Two weeks later, the teacher was visited again and the other half of the items left with him to be mailed when he had finished marking them.

After the 756 items had been marked by 100 superior and 100 inferior teachers, several statistical tests were applied to the responses to determine which items were marked quite differently by the two groups of teachers. It was found that 188 of the 756 items discriminated between the two groups at the 10 percent level of confidence, while 115 of them discriminated at the five percent level of confidence.

These items found to be discriminating, were put up in a final inventory and administered to 100 additional teachers at the fourth, fifth, and sixth-grade levels. These teachers were not selected in any way. They were "mine run" of fourth, fifth, and sixth-grade teachers. The purpose of this administration was to determine whether this inventory would actually discriminate between those who had a high level of rapport with their pupils and those who had a very low level of rapport. After the teachers had marked the inventory, three outside measures of their personality characteristics were determined. The first was a rating by the pupils. In most instances at least 25 pupils

rated each of the 100 teachers. The pupils rated the teacher on 50 items such as the following:

"Do you like school?"	Yes	No
"Does the teacher scold the pupils a lot?"	Yes	No
"Is the teacher usually bossy?"	Yes	No
"Does the teacher explain the schoolwork so that you can understand it?"	Yes	No
"Does the teacher speak to you when he meets you on the street?"	Yes	No

This pupil-rating scale proved to be very reliable and the pupils' rating of the teacher correlated with the teacher's score on the inventory .45.

The second outside measure of the teacher's personality was secured by asking the principal to rate the teacher on such characteristics as disciplinary ability personality versus subject matter point of view—the nature of the teacher's attitude toward children—the teacher's understanding of pupil behavior—and the attitude of the pupil toward the teacher. When the principal's rating scales had been scored for each of the teachers, they were found to correlate with the teacher's scores on the inventory .43.

Another measure of the teacher's personality was secured by asking an "expert" to spend enough time in each teacher's classroom to make a rather complete rating regarding maintenance of discipline—creating friendly classroom atmosphere—developing a feeling of security—exerting a stabilizing influence on the class—and developing pupils' self-reliance. When the expert's score for each of the 100 teachers was correlated with the teacher's score on the inventory, a correlation of .49 was obtained.

When the three criteria of personality, that is, the pupils' rating, the principal's rating, and the expert's rating were combined and correlated with the teacher's score on the attitude inventory, the correlation was .60 which is extremely high for this type of an experiment.

It should be said at this time that this experiment has been repeated two additional times in two different geographic regions of the country. Substantially the same results were obtained in all three of the experiments.

Now that we have found the nature of the items which discriminate between teachers who do and do not have the personality characteristics which we seek in teaching, it is desirable, at least for this meeting, that I tell you something about them. What do the items which discriminate reveal about the personality of teachers?



## THE INFERIOR TEACHER

Items in the Inventory discriminate sharply between teachers who have and those who do not have good rapport with pupils; examination of these items indicates that inferior teachers are essentially insecure socially. This may be caused by innumerable factors: general appearance, failure in heterosexual adjustment, low social status of family (a high proportion of teachers are from the upper-lower and lower-middle classes), failure to be accepted socially in high school, etc. The failure of a teacher to gain security in social relations before entering teaching militates against the gaining of security through social responses of pupils during teaching. The needs of the inferior teacher for social acceptance are not met through social relations with pupils. Security therefore is sought in other ways.

### 1. Hostility:

Frustration in social relations usually brings aggression in the form of *general hostility* toward people and, in the teacher, especially toward children. The teacher truly believes that most children are disobedient, do not appreciate what is done for them and cannot be trusted, and that modern parents do not teach children to behave. He believes that things are constantly "going on" in his classroom that are bad. He cautions himself to "watch out", "be alert", do not let the pupils "get away" with anything. He cannot trust people or have confidence in them.

### 2. Pharisaic Virtue:

The socially insecure teacher frequently seeks security through virtue. He adheres rigidly to conventional, middle-class standards. There is a tendency to be on the look-out for and to condemn, reject and punish anyone who violates conventional rules. All misbehavior is serious, to be dealt with severely, never to be passed off as a joke. There is little sense of humor, only a sense of justice perverted by general hostility toward people. There is a disposition to think in rigid, "all or none," "black and white" categories. ("Children should be seen and not heard"; "Children are too carefree.") There is also an exaggerated concern with sex. ("Children have no business asking questions about sex"; It is better for a child to be bashful than to be "boy or girl crazy.") He also tends to believe that he is always and unquestionably "in the right." ("The child must learn that 'teacher knows best.'") He has a tendency to be opposed to the unusual, the different, the imaginative, the creative, and the innovation. ("Children nowadays are allowed too much freedom in school"; "The whims and impulsive desires of children are not worthy of attention.")

### 3. Power Seeking:

The socially insecure teacher frequently

seeks security through a position of authority sometimes through degrees and diplomas. He tends to emphasize the dominance-submission, strong-weak, leader-follower dimension in his thinking. He frequently has a submissive, uncritical attitude toward authorities over him and a dominating, overbearing attitude toward subordinates. ("No child should rebel against authority"; "Aggressive children require the most attention.") He is likely to make exaggerated assertions of strength and toughness. ("To maintain good discipline in the classroom a teacher needs to be 'hardboiled.'")

### 4. Security Through Subject Matter:

The socially insecure teacher frequently seeks security through knowledge of subject matter. He is likely to assert that if one knows his subject well little else matters in teaching. ("A teacher should never acknowledge his ignorance of a topic in the presence of his pupils".)

## FACTORS RELATED TO TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD PUPILS

An attempt was made to determine whether or not certain personal variables were related to teaching attitudes by having 300 teachers (100 superior, 100 inferior and 100 randomly selected) fill out a personal data sheet as well as the attitude inventory. Information was obtained relative to age, sex, nationality, marital and parental status, training, teaching experience, grade level, subject taught, size of school system, liking for teaching, and whether or not a course in mental hygiene had been taken. Separate analyses were made for each of these groups of teachers. Findings may be summarized as follows:

1. In these three groups of teachers—sex, nationality, marital and parental status showed little or no relationship to teacher's attitude toward pupils.

2. Teachers in grades 1-3 tended to score higher than those in grades 4-6, who in turn scored higher than senior high school teachers; junior high school teachers (grades 7-8) scored lowest of all.

3. The teachers in the unselected group who like teaching "very much" scored significantly higher than those who liked it "fairly well."

4. Teachers who had had courses in mental hygiene scored significantly higher than those who had not in the superior group. This was not true in the inferior group, indicating that rigid hostile attitudes inhibit the effectiveness of such courses.

5. There is no relationship between attitude scores and intelligence. The correlations tend to cluster around .12 and are not significant.

### Norms

Norms have been established on twenty

different classifications of teachers, both during their training periods and after having several years of experience. A comparison of these norm groups is extremely interesting and adds to one's confidence in the instrument.

1. Students who enter the University of Minnesota with the idea of preparing to be elementary teachers rank two standard deviations higher on this scale than the average freshman entering the University (based on University of Missouri norms). The mean of the potential elementary teachers is at the 98th percentile of University freshman.

2. Students preparing to be secondary school teachers rank significantly below those preparing to become elementary teachers, but significantly higher than freshmen in other colleges, at the 90th percentile of University freshman.

3. During the junior year while taking professional theory courses both the elementary and the secondary teachers gained approximately two-thirds of a standard deviation in attitudes. During the senior year with practice teaching there was no loss or gain on the average. After one year of teaching the mean score drops to the pre-education level, i.e. a loss of two-thirds of a standard deviation.

4. Graduate students in education tend to rank higher in attitudes than any other group of experienced teachers tested.

5. Among elementary teachers the lowest ranking groups are rural teachers and teachers with two years of training who are teaching in small school systems.

6. There is a significant difference between the scores of elementary teachers who have two and four years of training. The difference is approximately one-half standard deviation in favor of four years of training.

7. There is a significant difference between elementary teachers who teach in systems of more than twenty-one teachers. The difference is approximately two-thirds of a standard deviation.

8. At the secondary level academic teachers rank higher than non-academic teachers. The difference is about one-half standard deviation. Teachers of music, art, and physical education tend to rank low. The highest ranking group at the high school level were the experienced vocational agriculture teachers. These teachers work most closely with their students and the parents of their students.

9. High school teachers with a master's degree rated two-thirds of a standard deviation above teachers with a bachelor's degree. This was true for both academic and non-academic teachers.

10. Preliminary studies indicate that if the test is given at the time the students enter upon their professional training and five years later after they have taught two or three years, that the correlation between



the scores is .43 suggesting that the Inventory is an important index at the time the student enters upon teacher education as to what his attitudes will be after teaching two or three years.

11. The attitude inventory was administered to all the teachers in the St. Paul Public School System. Some of the results are as follows:

a. There were 291 elementary school teachers with degrees from liberal arts colleges, teachers colleges, and university graduates. The average scores of these groups were as follows: liberal arts, 36; teachers colleges, 51; university, 57. All of these differences are significant at the one percent level of the 459 secondary school teachers, 114 had their degrees from liberal arts colleges, 66 from teachers colleges and 279 from universities. The mean scores of these three groups were as follows: liberal arts 27, teachers colleges 26, and universities 42.

b. The percentage of pupils failed by secondary teachers in the St. Paul Schools was studied in relation to the scores of these teachers on the *Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory*. There were 395 teachers in this study. The correlation between failure rate and attitude score was .65 for women who teach science and .54 for women who teach social studies. For both men and women in the academic subjects, the coefficient is .35. For men teaching industrial arts the correlation is .53. For all teachers of non-academic subjects, the correlation is .23.

c. In St. Paul 602 elementary teachers marked the *Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory*. 238 of these teachers had two years of training; 291 had four years of training; and 73 had five or more years of training.

The attitude scores of these three groups were as follows: 2 years of college, a mean score of 21; 4 years of college, a mean score of 51; and 5 or more years of college, a mean score of 66.

d. In St. Paul when the scores of elementary teachers in self-contained classrooms (N-587) were compared with those of special teachers of art, home economics, industrial arts, music, and physical education (N-52) also teaching in elementary schools, the scores were as follows: self-contained classroom teachers a mean score of 41, special teachers a mean score of 28.

I have spent most of my time describing the results of the research dealing with the personality characteristics which are essential for effective teaching, partially because these characteristics and the tests designed to measure them are not generally understood. We never reject a student on the basis of personality scores alone. They serve as a screening device and alert us to certain students whose behavior should be studied rather systematically before continuing long in the teacher education program.

Students entering the fifth year of teacher education at the University of Minnesota take a battery of tests during their first quarter in the program. The tests are as follows: A general academic aptitude test, *The Miller Analogies* supplemented by *The Ohio Psychological*; a test of mathematical achievement based largely on high school mathematics which enables us to guide students into teaching areas. The third test is in the field of English expression and measures largely accuracy and correctness in matters of English composition. The fourth test is an educational background test, measuring

the ability of students to apply the principles learned in the undergraduate courses in education. We established norms for these tests based on our own graduate students. Those students who rank below the 16th percentile are discouraged from continuing in the master's degree program, while students above the 84th percentile are interviewed and counseled with a view to encouraging them to do advanced graduate work beyond the master's level.

A personnel folder, giving important personal data, record of teaching and work experience, academic honors, and the undergraduate transcript of credits is also compiled for each student during his first quarter at the University. The test scores are made a part of this record, one copy of which is in his adviser's file and the other in the dean's office. The early identification of superior talent is given greater emphasis and is more important than the elimination of students at the lower end of the scale. No student is admitted to candidacy for a master's degree until after he has completed at least one-quarter of graduate work with a "B" average and the other standards outlined above have been met.

A study of the effectiveness with which the battery of tests described above predicts success of graduate students is reported in *School and Society*, Volume 56, Page 192-195 under the title, "Predicting Success of Graduate Students in the College of Education". A more complete description of the research involved in the development of the *Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory* will be found in the manual which accompanies the material and is published by The Psychological Corporation, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York 36, New York.

## An Analysis of Outcomes of the Conferences on the Fifth Year of Teacher Education

HOWARD T. BATCHELDER

### CONCEPTS HELD IN AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE CONTENT OF THE FIFTH YEAR OF TEACHER EDUCATION

1. The program should provide students the opportunity to broaden and to increase their knowledge in teaching fields.

2. The fifth year should broaden the students' understanding of the foundation areas of education such as philosophy and the history of education.

3. The fifth year should provide students with the opportunity to broaden their cultural background through general education courses.

4. The program should aim to increase

the professional competencies of the classroom teachers, to increase their knowledge in the area of professional education, and to provide the student with the opportunity to critically examine educational theory and method.

5. The fifth year should provide students with the opportunity to increase their understanding of how a democratic society functions, to present concepts peculiar to teaching in a democratic society, and to teach students how to become better citizens themselves.

6. The fifth year should provide the student with a better understanding of the process of human growth and of the conditions of learning and should include such areas as

educational psychology, adolescent growth and development, and child psychology.

7. The program should emphasize advanced methods of teaching and the ability to teach.

8. The fifth year curriculum should provide broad professional laboratory experiences, especially direct experiences with children.

9. The fifth year should give the student the opportunity to examine the function of the school in the community and to understand how to use community resources in teaching his subject area.

10. The program should require and place emphasis on communication skills.

11. The fifth year should give the student

an understanding of group process and an understanding of human and public relations.

12. The fifth year should provide the students with a better understanding of the guidance function as a classroom teacher, an understanding of the nature of extra-class activities, the knowledge of audio-visual education, and an understanding of the role of the teacher in school administration, including finances.

13. The fifth year should provide opportunities for student self-appraisal and also an understanding in the evaluation of student progress.

14. The fifth year should instill an understanding of the need for scientific inquiry in education so that the students will carry that understanding over into their teaching assignments.

15. The fifth year program should contribute to the building of professional consciousness, which would encourage greater participation in professional organizations and promote recognition of the need for continuous professional growth.

#### CONCEPTS HELD IN AGREEMENT CONCERNING CERTAIN ASPECTS OF ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE FIFTH YEAR PROGRAM

1. Flexibility ought to be stressed in the program to consider individual needs, therefore, emphasis on counseling.

2. The fifth year should be planned as a continuation of the Undergraduate program, but planned cooperatively between graduate and undergraduate schools.

3. Fifth year students should be required to start the program within a reasonable time after receiving the undergraduate degree, but experience prior to enrolling in the program would be desirable.

4. Teacher education should be a unified experience, and therefore there should be a definite unity between the fifth year curriculum and the undergraduate curriculum.

5. The curriculum should be a cooperative enterprise worked out by all segments of the college or university, community leaders and administrators.

6. The fifth year should be developed for teachers—not merely for administrators.

7. The ideal pattern of the program should

be the same—generally—for secondary and elementary majors.

8. The fifth year should emphasize scholastic achievement.

9. The program should require completion of certificate requirements in three teaching areas.

10. Research in the fifth year of education should be encouraged by the colleges and universities.

11. The fifth year should continue to be a part of the requirements for permanent teaching certificates.

#### CONTROVERSIAL CONCEPTS CONCERNING THE FIFTH YEAR IN TEACHER EDUCATION

1. There was disagreement upon the amount of teaching experience required of individuals entering the fifth year program.

1. There was disagreement on the degree of rigidity that fifth year programs should maintain.

3. There was disagreement upon the amount of practical and theoretical research requirements in the fifth year.

4. There was disagreement on whether or not the fifth year should culminate in a master's degree.

## A Fifth Year—Why?

H. GORDON HULLFISH

The title I have selected for the remarks that follow surely warrants a word of comment. It in no way suggests that you in this State have been wrong to move forward with a bold program, and an imaginative one, in an effort to improve the educational opportunity, and the educative growth, of the future citizens of Indiana, contributing thereby to the improvement of citizenship in the nation and in the world. Quite the contrary is the case. I have nothing but admiration for the leadership you are giving the rest of us by making it clear that the first degree does not mark the end of the road in the preparation of teachers for our public schools. Further, your provisions for the continuing fruitful relationships of those in this State whose business it is to be concerned with the improvement of teacher education, whether they represent the organized teaching profession of the State, the teacher education institutions, the parents, or, indeed, the students, are to be commended. Nothing but good can come from this sharing of concern and knowledge by those whose daily activities relate to this problem in specifically differing ways. Not the least of the eventual fruitage of this shared effort, if I may say so somewhat parenthetically, will be your progressively deepened realization that the future of democracy rests upon our ability and our readiness, to extend the base of our common concerns as we at the same time

gain an enhanced understanding of our properly individualized interests.

In addressing my title, I am, in fact, talking to myself. In addressing you, hesitant as I am to reveal my ignorance, I am assuming that your continuing interest in this problem will in some miraculous way transform a soliloquy into a shared experience. It occurs to me, indeed, that were those of us who teach unable to assume this we could not teach at all. My advantage in this situation is that some knowledge of the lively intellectual character of your past conferences makes it possible for me to assume the presence of interest, whereas teachers generally can assume no more than that their success in sharing ideas with students is all one with their ability to arouse interest in that which they know and wish to teach.

At one level my question answers itself. The fifth year is a means and an opportunity. It is a means designed to advance the status and the quality of teaching. It is an opportunity to withhold the final stamp of certification in those instances where either ability or circumstance makes this action appropriate. More significantly, it is an opportunity to create progressively improved conditions of learning for all the young people, including those who will teach, of Indiana. Perhaps, to put it in terms of your program for this Conference, it may be said to be an opportunity for the responsible

agencies of this State to create the conditions from which the master teacher will emerge in ever-increasing numbers. If I exhibit some hesitation in using the wording of your program, and I do, simply because it is a bit rash for any one teacher to suggest that he can describe the master teacher, I have no hesitation in saying that it is an opportunity steadily to advance the level of teaching efficiency in Indiana.

At another level questions, not answers, confront me. Are we interested in a fifth year because we have found it impossible to do an adequate job in four? Are we the victims of change in "professional fashions" much as the ladies are the victims of Dior? Do we assume, therefore, that a fifth year will in some way give us a guarantee that we are academically respectable? Is the reach for a fifth year a response to the spate of criticism the schools have had to endure of late, especially the schools that prepare the teachers? Are we saying, "Give us another year, we'll show you?" What, however, can be shown those who say, as a speaker did in Chicago at the recent meeting of the National Education Association, that he finds the college student quite well prepared to do his work, despite the fact that he has been taught by teachers who have been trained so badly? Are we seeking either to build up graduate programs in education or to place our teachers on a salary escalator? Are we trying in left-handed fashion to change those requirements for the master's degree, such as writing a thesis, which have long seemed to be beyond change? Are we



simply trying to be sure that our former students get a chance to take more work in each of the areas we emphasized in their undergraduate program? Are we, in our enthusiasms for change, going along somewhat unreflectively with an idea we have never examined seriously?

As I think about these questions I generate very little interest in the problem which is the fifth year. The *why* of the matter must lead us beyond the limits these questions set. I believe it does. In one direction it leads to the reconstruction of the years that precede it. In another direction it leads to the reconstruction of persons—persons who may panic before the demands of the initial teaching situation, or who may revert to old habits in a hasty reach for security when the job seems so different from the preparation for it, or who find themselves—almost for the first time—involved in activity which makes the need to learn imperative and the act of learning purposeful.

This is not the place to give consideration to the reconstruction of the four-year teacher education programs (though at some point you must do so) which bring your people to this fifth year. Yet there are some things that should be said. Whatever the eventual form of these programs they should surely lead the participants to a lively interest in the act of teaching, to a realization of the potential for personal growth involved in helping others grow. They should help each individual gain a sense of being a responsible participant in this moment of decision when the future of free men is far from assured. The whole character of education is at stake in this decision. They should lead students to knowledge, and to a love of knowledge—getting-knowledge of whatever it is that each selects to teach and knowledge of the ways in which his “subject matter” may enter into the experience of young people in order to transform them at progressive stages of their development into more effective persons. On either score, most of us seldom know enough. And they should avoid rigidity. They should, for example, enable those who, later than others, conclude that teaching can be an exciting adventure—perhaps because summer employment placed them on a playground, perhaps because they met a teacher who obviously enjoyed what he was doing—to enter the lists in preparation for it with a minimum of delay in eventual graduation. When we discover some who would join our ranks whose motivation and intelligence are not in question we should not be bound by past decisions.

If I may add but a word on this last point, let me say that I hold the deep conviction that we should never permit the requirements we set up in the abstract to help us deal in orderly manner with the general run of students, and for this purpose the requirements are necessary, to keep us from dealing intelligently with the particular student,

especially that student whose eyes sparkle in anticipation as he talks about his newly come upon interest in teaching. To be sure, I would hope to meet the sparkling eye in the first course in the program, and I am convinced we must do more to assure ourselves that this will be the case. Perhaps the current program in Indianapolis to give high school students a cadet relationship with experienced teachers is one that should be cultivated more widely. If it is, I hope that the relationship is always established with teachers who are daily enjoying what they do. It may just be that the tone of many classrooms is one fact that makes it difficult for young people to visualize themselves as future teachers.

Our concern here, however, is with the other lead suggested by the *why* of the matter, what I have chosen to call “the reconstruction of persons.” Our problem of creating better teachers (or, if you will, master teachers) would be simplified if we could but educate the student when he is on campus in ways that would eliminate, either for us or for him, any need for further reflection about successful teaching. This achievement is forever beyond us, however, though but a few years ago, when a psychology of specifics was at its zenith, it seemed to many almost to be within our grasp. This does not mean that much may not be learned on campus, that the prospective teacher may not be prepared in ways that help him escape chaos when he confronts his first class. It does mean, however, that the teaching situation as it develops is a leading situation for the teacher quite as much as it is for the students. A bag of tricks, no matter how well stuffed the bag, will not do. What one knows has to be put to the test of developing situation after developing situation to see whether it is knowledge in these situations or whether it is instrumental to the securing of knowledge appropriate to them. My point is this. Try as we may to turn out the most complete persons that our intelligence permits us to conceive we shall fall short if we neglect the fact that coming into personhood represents a movement that has no end, an act that is never done.

I could say this another way and suggest that what is at issue is the building of flexible habits on the part of the prospective teacher, not fixed ones. Or, to put it yet differently, the concern is to bring to the classrooms of the country (in this case, Indiana) teachers whose every act is characterized by a reflective quality. In each instance, of course, I am suggesting that the imaginative, probing, questing teacher is to be preferred to the mechanical and routinized one. I presume no one among us doubts this in theory. Each of us will have to decide how firm is this attachment in practice, however.

It is along in here that I find an answer emerging for the *why* of the fifth year. Since we shall be unable to educate the student

in ways that guarantee he will have no further need to reflect upon his purposes nor to survey critically his teaching acts, the function of the fifth year should be to help him with his reflection and with a critical analysis of the appropriateness and adequacy of his teaching. If this seems obvious, I am sorry that my limited grasp of the problem before us compels me to state it. I must say, however, that I am fearful the essential *why* of the problem may disappear if we focus too exclusively upon questions of how much added subject matter the fifth year may make possible for a given student, how many additional courses in educational methods or child study should be required, whether a given number of courses pursued within a set period may not be substituted for a master's thesis, and the like. All of these are important questions. You have discussed them with insight and courage in previous conferences. I simply doubt that continued discussion of them, in this form, will advance your thinking appreciably.

The present challenge, it seems to me, no matter which facet of this shared problem we represent, is to find ways to bear down on this new teacher so that he is aware of himself as being involved in the reflective re-examination of what he is doing as a teacher, what he ought to do and what, under the circumstances of his employment, he may do. In a volume I had some association with it was said that, “It is the business of the philosophy of education to make clear what is involved in the action which is carried on in the educational field, to transform a preference which is blind, based on custom rather than thought, into an intelligent choice—one made, that is, with consciousness of what is aimed at.”<sup>1</sup> I am suggesting in a word, that this is exactly the business of the fifth year, plus the provision that the teacher, as he becomes involved in his self-scrutiny, is given institutional help that will enable him to carry it on at the highest level of intellectual achievement of which he is capable. If I seem to be pursuing a philosophical interest, this may be so. I am not at all concerned that it be so designated, however, I am only concerned that what is at issue be recognized and tackled. I find support for my specific concern here as it relates to the fifth year for the student of teaching in a statement made by John Dewey about the role of philosophy in relationship to the general state of human affairs.

“There are issues in the conduct of human affairs in their production of good and evil which, at a given time and place, are so central, so strategic in position, that their urgency deserves, with respect to practice, the names ultimate and comprehensive. These issues demand the most system-

<sup>1</sup>Kilpatrick, William H. (editor), *The Educational Frontier*, p. 288.



atic reflective attention that can be given. It is relatively unimportant whether this attention be called philosophy or by some other name. It is of immense human importance that it be given, and that it be given by the best tested resources that inquiry has at command."<sup>2</sup>

I have not pulled my answer to my question out of the hat, much as this may seem to be the case. I know, for instance, as you do, that learning and interest are inter-related, that the former is a consequence of the latter, that effort is a function of interest. And, try as we may on campus, the experiences we provide the student are but shadowy representations of the reality which is his initial employment. On campus he may talk about, and reflect upon, his problems; on the job he must do something about them before they overwhelm him. This contrast holds even where it may not seem to, as, for instance, in the case of student teaching. The latter is real enough, as the fears of the students who approach it attest. It is, however, just what its title suggests. It is not yet teaching on one's own; it is still part of the campus program. When a full day of teaching is to begin the next morning; when a class is confronted and no critic teacher is present as a silent partner whose very presence is a disciplinary control; when a careful plan for an hour of work has been covered in twenty minutes when children ask questions that have not been predicted and for which answers will not come; when teachers who have lost whatever enthusiasm they may once have had announce carpingly that what has been learned on campus should be forgotten; when a sudden realization dawns that a regulation here, a pressure there, and a gradually emerging surrounding atmosphere are leading to the erosion of principles heretofore held high—when these and the countless other things of daily occurrence arise for the new teacher, a learning situation has been created of a character never attained by those of us who try valiantly to prepare our students for the tasks of the profession.

It is true, of course, that where we have had a measure of success, and given the circumstances of our labor we have done remarkably well, the new teacher is not overwhelmed but, rather, initiates his own learning and gains the exhilarating sense of being somewhat in control of his own destiny. Some are overwhelmed, to be sure, often beyond recovery. Others, as suggested earlier, may slip into habits they know to be wrong but which, as they find security, they eventually come to prize. All, however, except the few who may know at once that their decision to enter teaching was a wrong one, are candidates for directed learning. Our problem is

to find some way to give immediate help to those who are prepared to initiate their own program of learning as they plan and teach, to throw out a kind of moral sand for those who would readily slip back to the safety routine of habit, and to do what we can to guide those whose initial mistake was to decide upon teaching as a career into activities in which they may take hold of life with the satisfaction that accrues when capacity and task bear a promising relation one to the other.

What I am suggesting may be impossible of achievement. I am sure I would not suggest it were I part of almost any other conference. But, here, where the teacher education institutions of a single state have joined with the teachers' association of that state, as well as with the Department of Public Instruction and other related state-wide interest, to gain the widest possible involvement of all whose intelligence may contribute to the improvement of teaching, it seems right to do so. Even so, given the best of all possible conditions for testing an idea, I may be wide of the mark. Yet one thing seems more and more clear to me. The success of the fifth year may be measured eventually by the reflective nature of the period which comes between it and the completion of the four-year program. And, in consequence, another idea emerges with a bit of certainty. A proper five-year program will make provision, as you have done, for responsible entry into the teaching profession before the fifth year of study is started. It will not extend the campus program by the simple addition of another year.

Specifically, I would suggest that this Conference plan what may be thought of as "regional opportunities" for those who have entered their first year teaching to come together, under the direction of appropriate individuals in each region, to share their concerns, their problems, and their successes. I doubt that we can do enough to promote that wholesome sense of *togetherness* which results when individuals examine their common concerns and gain a realizing sense of being a part of an undertaking which others obviously value—in this case, the provision of the best conditions for the development of young people that pooled intelligence can devise. I do not have in mind a "credit activity" that will later reduce the required hours of the campus program, though I would reach for status for these conferences by encouraging school boards to pay the expense of those who attend. My concern is to bring these new teachers together at a time when their effort to be articulate about their problems as they endeavor to communicate with others who are equally concerned will pay dividends in the form of a re-examination of the purposes that direct their activities; an assessment of their practices in the light of success or failure that others report; a widened perspective in con-

sequence of viewing the specific difficulties of a particular class, school or community in their relationship to their appearance universally in other classes, schools or communities; and an eagerness to return to the home base to try out hypotheses which a cooperative effort of this sort will surely bring to the fore.

I dare not suggest that my own experience convinces me that such a scheme is sure to be successful, or to be better than others you may have already considered and discarded. My experience in attempting to teach philosophy of education over a considerable period of years, however, has made it clear to me that my students seek guidance from philosophy only when they are forced to reflect upon the adequacy of what they have taken for granted heretofore (on our campus this usually means that their need arises in the senior year, a year in which student teaching occurs and when the day of their full employment as teachers begins to loom up as in the immediate future). They do not sense a need for philosophy, that is, a need to think more deeply, more persistently, about what they do until the doing itself, or the immediate need to do, calls old habit or established preference into question. In short, they are impelled to think, as we often tell them is the case with thinking in general, when occasions demand that they do so. The new teacher, goodness knows, faces the occasions. I am arguing only that a cooperative effort to improve teaching, to advance the concept of the master teacher, must in some way match the occasions with designed opportunities.

It is my hunch that such regional opportunities for the new teacher to think more critically about his activity than he would otherwise be able to do should be provided in late autumn and in mid-spring and that they should be given dignity and status by being thought of as a necessary step to take toward eventual participation in the fifth year of study. Would it be too much to suggest that each teacher education institution in Indiana be given responsibility for a region, that each such institution assign the conference responsibility to a member of the staff, and that each such staff member bring to the conference for responsible participation along with the new teachers successful teachers whose growing edges are always showing? If this seems to be an ambitious program, let me say that you are already engaged in one and should now do nothing less than may be required to make it progressively more successful. And, if the program, in fact, is impracticable, given the conditions of a state which you understand as I do not, it may, as you discard it after evaluating it, nevertheless be suggestive. Of one point I am convinced. The time to start the improvement of teaching is when the enthusiasm of the person whose work is to be improved is high, and this will be within

<sup>2</sup>Dewey, John. *Problems of Men*. pp. 11-12.

the first months of his experience. To add a fifth year for a teacher who, after three, four or five, or seven, eight or nine, years of teaching, has worn smooth the bottom of the ruts of his habits, may provide attractive window dressing for an educational system but will do little to produce an improved teacher, much less the master teacher.

This brings me to a point which it is difficult to discuss because I may not be able to give it a tangible character. It is no accident that so much of our time and energy is devoted to the improvement of the curriculum. Here is something we can take hold of, adding to it, withdrawing elements or rearranging them. But no curriculum is better than those who teach it; and, as we have surely come to know, no matter how we re-make it, its old form may prevail as what is new is filtered through the unchanged habits of teachers. Apart from the fact that habit is inevitable (there is, of course, no inevitability about the development of habits which are so fixed that men are reduced to mechanisms) we must realize that teaching occurs in a total social setting, not merely in a classroom, and that what we may call "the atmosphere" of this setting has as much to do, if not more, with the eventual form and quality of education as does the curriculum. I am not suggesting that we may ignore the curriculum problem. I suggest only that we kid ourselves when we consider it alone, ignoring all else that bears upon the complex activity which education is.

If we may pursue this matter further, let's see what is suggested for this continuing conference (I assume that this is not the final meeting, that my speech has no lethal quality). Two things suggest themselves at once, the quality of the administration and the quality of the colleagues with whom the new teacher is associated.

The administrators of this State may be the critical factor in determining the success or failure of all the hopes for the improvement of teaching which are represented in the work of this Conference. These hopes surely involve the recognition that what the democratic aspiration now desperately needs to sustain it in a world that is almost overcome by its anxieties is citizens of an informed and sensitive intelligence, citizens who respect ideas and who respect persons. This need sets forth the directing purpose for the schools of a democracy and each classroom should reflect it, in ways appropriate to it and to the level of development of the students. There is no magic formula that will bring this end to pass, of course. There is no single method that all may equally use. Yet there is a quality in the human relationship that is unmistakable when men share the belief that each person is entitled to respect until, in the shared situation, he demonstrates his unwillingness to play the game in these terms. And so with the holding

of ideas. Then men reject ideas simply because they are different, simply because to consider them seriously may lead to a need to reconstruct certain ideas they presently cherish, the erosion of democratic life is already in process. An idea, too, is entitled to a fair test in the give and take of shared thought. It is only thus that we may know whether in rejecting one, we are rejecting, in fact, some part of our past, some part, perhaps, that we had hoped would mark off our future as reflecting the glory of free men. I need not call your attention specifically to the basically irresponsible actions of certain people in high places during recent years to illustrate my point.

I believe that this Conference should give special attention to this problem, working with the administrators of the State in whatever ways will get them to consider the vital role they play in bringing the new teacher to a stage of security in becoming a contributor to the improvement of citizenship through the development of persons who are equipped with the temper and the techniques upon which democratic human relationships depend. Teachers, new or old, will make no major contribution to this end when the administrators to whom they are responsible treat them impersonally, fitting them into a smooth running organization, either subtly denying them a chance to think about the problems of the school system of which they are a part or actively discouraging them from doing so. There is little likelihood that these qualities will be warmly present, as they should be, in the classroom, when they are not experienced by those we put in charge of the classroom. I do not mean, of course, that the administrator has to consult each teacher on each decision he reaches. This caricature of democracy is too often inserted in discussion as a way of escaping the problem of discovering what it is that democracy does mean in a given situation. I doubt, indeed, that it is proper to talk about the democratic way of life, as if some one had laid it out in its varying parts on a blueprint that the rest of us could follow. My experiences this summer in spending many hours in pleasant and fruitful association with a colleague from the University of London bears out my hunch on this score. His entire pattern of experience—his way of life, if you please—differs radically from mine, yet my belief in democracy in no way outstrips his. I shall be happy to discover before our association ends that mine equals his. I doubt not at all, however, that the principles here emphasized, respect for the individual person and respect for the individual idea, may serve us continuously as instruments in finding out, situation by situation, what it is that our commitment to democracy requires of us.

We should be quite honest with ourselves at this point. We all know how often it occurs that the lively, enthusiastic teacher

of mid-September is the jaded, disillusioned teacher of December. Irwin Edman once said that we could not go on teaching, if we were to think about our former students too much. There is a measure of truth in this suggestion, about as much as there would be were I to add to it, "we could not go on teaching students to become teachers." It has been my experience that too many former students return to the campus with stories of the ways in which they have been told by administrators and colleagues, sometimes indirectly, often brutally, that it was time to put aside what they had learned on the campus and get down to the practical level of common sense. Moreover, I have yet to fail to find in every senior class I teach a considerable number of students who have already been informed by administrators and teachers in the field that what they are now learning will do them little good when they enter the classroom. It is possible to go on teaching under these circumstances, however, for one reason, if no other—namely, the resistance the newly graduated teachers offer when this advice is given. They are not ready to admit that their own education has been a waste of time, even when they are ready to admit that the work of the campus has not always helped them cope with the problems they confront. Edman is wrong. It is the quiet determination of those former students, now teachers, who fight the odds and, though losing a battle here and another there, return again and again determined to win the next one, that sustains those who teach. But to say this in no way removes our need to be honest about the situation as it exists.

The fact that what is said on campus does not always work in the field is easily understood. The campus is not the field. No other explanation is needed. You cannot use three or four textbooks, when only one is provided. You cannot be sweet and reasonable in situations that call for discipline, when the surrounding approach to discipline is to accuse and punish whether sure of your facts or not. This, in the hope, though the wrong individuals may on occasion be disciplined, that to treat them firmly, if not harshly, will be good for them in any case. You cannot promote student planning in schools where teachers themselves are not participants in planning. You cannot discuss all sides of an issue, when the administration lets it be known that there is one side of certain issues which is never to be talked about, whether this issue falls in the area of religion, politics, economics, world organization, or sex. You cannot use the field trip, when a fixed schedule is so valued that deviation is not permitted. You cannot put forward your ideas in staff meetings, when it becomes evident that to do so will interrupt the flow of business the chairman has planned. But why go on? Each member of this Conference is quite capable of filling out the picture.

The campus, of course, cannot prepare for



the field in a specific sense, either in a four-year program or in a fifth year. This does not mean that specific field situations should not be examined and brought about. They should be. There is no other way to gain hypotheses for the control of the situations that do in fact later arise. Always, however, the future teacher should recognize that hypotheses are being dealt with and always, too, he should experience himself as being part of a situation in which learning how to deal with hypotheses is of central concern. When the work of the field is so reflected on campus, there will be no exception that what is learned in the one place will exactly fit the other. The job of the campus is so to teach that the teacher education graduates will be able to engage their students in experiences where thinking is valued as a normal aspect of carrying on life. The new teacher, who is surely not God, should not arrive on the job knowing how to deal with all situations that will later confront him, nor should administrators expect him to be so prepared. He should arrive, however, with the confidence that comes from having had the opportunity to learn to trust his ideas through a process which encouraged him to put ideas forward and to put them to the test of a critically shared intelligence. This is specific preparation and beyond this we can neither go, nor need we try.

There is yet another way in which the campus must watch itself, if whatever gap exists between it and the field is to be narrowed. It is frequently possible on campus, as the chance is at hand to think beyond the established practices of the schools, to move to the frontiers of thought and plan ways of correcting evils which are plainly to be observed. It is in this way that many of the changes in school practices have been advanced. And this opportunity must never be denied those whose spirit and imagination leads them to such creative endeavor. Without this opportunity a campus would be little more than a factory, putting together intellectual furniture in journeyman fashion. But a danger arises at this point nevertheless. We may become so certain on campus of the rightness of our ideas that we give the student experience with no others, even when we know that he will teach in situations which, at this stage of their development, will not welcome these ideas. There is nothing quite so tragic as the frustration of dedicated persons who feel that to acquiesce to the demands of a situation as it exists is to be disloyal to a teacher who knew so well that he was right that he made his students feel contemptuous of practices that differed. Again, of course, campus and field clash and administrators and teachers, wearying of the implied criticism of their efforts which these frustrations suggest, dismiss four years of study with a shrug that says, "You can't take it with you when you graduate."

The simple fact is that we have not always helped the administrator or the experienced teacher play a helpful role in inducting the new teacher into the profession. I am arguing that you try to do so. I think I would start first with the administrators. They create the atmosphere within which all, new teachers and experienced ones, do their work. If they come to understand better than they now generally do what a critical relationship they bear to the advancement of good teaching in a system, if they come to feel themselves to be participating responsibly in the improvement of the quality of teaching in this State as a whole, the success of your Conference will be accelerated. And one other good will accrue. Finding themselves to be sharing ideas with an alerted and responsible profession they will make those gains in stature and courage which are now needed to hold at arm's length the limiting forces in some communities which want to thwart educational purposes appropriate to a free people in order that their meager values may be served exclusively.

All that I have tried to suggest in these last pages, and more will be discovered by the new teacher within the first weeks of his teaching. It is at this time that he will need help, help that continues his pattern of being a student of his problems, not the help that leads him to skirt his problems by offering his formulae about which he need not think. If I am right in my analyses, then I return to the suggestion of creating regional opportunities for the sharing of thought about improving what each new teacher has to do in any case. We gain insight—indeed, we are educated—as the experience we are having undergoes reconstruction as we reflect upon it and discover meanings within it that were heretofore not in evidence. Thus we may say of education, as Archibald MacLeish said of democracy, that "it is a thing a'doing, never a thing done." If this Conference can create a condition which makes this spirit emerge universally within the schools of this State, then the fifth year itself will be affected. It will be asked to make good by students (the returning teachers) who know what it is to have their intelligence challenged because they have been involved in challenging the intelligence of others.

To all of this I would add one other suggestion. I would want the staff representative of each teacher education institution, to whom the responsibility for creating the regional opportunities for growth will have been assigned, to serve as a guide to fifth year participation for the new teachers entering his region. Not all new teachers should start the fifth year at the same time, and this quite apart from their personal opportunity to do so. Some should be urged to take an advanced study quickly, others to wait; some should be encouraged to dig hard

within a field of knowledge, others to make a special study of the basic factors bearing upon child growth and development; some may need to know what restrictions are placed upon public schools by our historic separation of church and state, others may need to become acquainted with the criticisms of those who insist that Johnny has not learned to read. All will be feeling their way toward the next steps they should take. The regional staff person could help them think their way into a program of maximum benefit to them as he locates the directions of their growing. What he suggested would have to be adjusted to the requirements of the particular campus to which the teacher returned for advanced work. He could not substitute for local advisor. He could help the latter immeasurably, however.

I am very conscious at this point of having asked you to give your attention in this Conference to matters which may seem to be somewhat removed from the center of your interest. I am conscious, also, of dealing with some matters that do not lend themselves readily to proof. Yet I am naive enough, or possess sufficient temerity, to suggest that these are matters you must think upon if you want this Conference to get beyond repetitive discussion of curriculum arrangements. What I have proposed warrants consideration as hypothesis only, as a way of catching up young people as they are ready to learn and so helping them use all of the experience they are having as grist for their intellectual mills that they will be impatient to translate this experience into operating terms for their own classrooms. Democracy needs the enthusiasm of those whose dedication rests upon a deepened insight into the basic principles upon which the democratic aspiration feeds, the conjoint sharing of common concerns, a sharing characterized by the humaneness that emerges when respect is given both persons and ideas. It is my hunch that within what I have suggested there lies the possibility of creating both the enthusiasm and its ground.

If I seem to have gone beyond your problem in some way, to have by-passed its earthiness, let me say that my effort has been to tackle it where it has its most significant meaning. John Dewey once said that, "Those who received education are those who give it: habits already engendered deeply influence its course. It is as if no one could be educated in the full sense until everyone is developed beyond the reach of prejudice, stupidity and apathy." And to this he added, "There is no possibility of complete escape from this circle. Education returns upon itself in such a multitude of ways as to render out of the question any short cut solution. It is a matter of accelerating momentum in the right direction, and of increasing the effective energy of the factors that make for



removing obstacles."<sup>3</sup> This sums up my exact purpose, not to escape a circle from which no escape is possible, but to find ways, working within it, to keep it in a constant process

<sup>3</sup>*Philosophy and Civilization*, pp. 315-316.

of reshaping as, thinking together, we become steadily more intelligent about giving direction to those into whose hands the teaching function in this society falls. We shall need to be patient. And we can be, since there is reason to be hopeful.

lost many potential scientists for the profession.

#### Comments:

1. "Integrated" courses needed—not survey type.
2. Emphasis must be placed on the laboratory, or experimental approach, project methods, field trips, and use of community resources.
3. Employ in colleges "master elementary teachers" under college staff direction in summer to help guide and advise new teachers—the "fifth year" teachers.
4. Methods can best be taught through the subject matter.
5. Need courses to "bring teacher up to date."

#### Recommendations:

Before completing the "fifth year" it is strongly recommended that the teacher's program have included:

- I. An integrated course in modern basic concepts in science—to broaden understanding and to bring student "up to date."
- II. Training in laboratory or experimental techniques on a broad basis for demonstrating scientific principles with simple materials, home-made equipment, tools available in the community, or materials from field trips.

(Extent to which an individual would need above in the "fifth year" would depend on his previous training, practical experience, or independent study.)

#### Secondary School Teacher

##### Comments:

1. The secondary school science teacher almost always teaches more than one science or other subjects. Broad training is necessary.
2. Flexibility for an individual's program is strongly recommended but in general at least one-half of the fifth year should be in the field of specialization—in science.

##### Recommendations:

I. Three areas of science training or experience should be adequately covered before completion of fifth year:

- A. An *integrated* (not survey) course in modern and basic concepts of science, cutting across traditional scientific boundaries.
- B. Advanced training in laboratory work—for demonstrations, illustrations, experiments. This would be the teaching of methods through subject matter.
- C. Advanced work in one science of special interest to "fifth year" teacher.

II. During the "fifth year" the student should have opportunity to develop further his understanding of the social and psychological aspects of education, through advanced work not duplicating his previous training.

III. The balance of the "fifth year" pro-

# Reports of Study Groups

## Group I Science

**PURPOSE.** Objectives of the science group were twofold:

(1) To consider general principles which should govern the fifth year program and action that would be required to promote application of the principles.

(2) To consider and make recommendations concerning the content of the fifth year program for science teachers.

**MEMBERSHIP.** The group of 16 members were all from Indiana. Four were science teachers and one was a vocational agriculture and science teacher at the secondary level. The others were professors, deans, or supervisors of teachers in colleges and universities.

**PROCEDURE.** The leader introduced the members of the group and then reviewed the summary of the previous conferences. Controversial concepts were taken up in detail with all members participating.

#### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. General principles which were to be presented to the conference at large were discussed. The following outline contains these recommendations:

I. What principles should govern a good fifth year program in teacher education?

1. The fifth year should be a balanced program including work in general education, field of specialization, and professional education, with emphasis in this order.

2. It is strongly recommended that the fifth year program not be completed before the student has had on-the-job practical experience.

3. Flexibility should be permitted in planning the program. This means flexibility for the institution to organize its own program and flexibility to plan a specific program for an individual student. (For example, it may be desirable for an individual student to include more supervised practice at the graduate level.)

4. Flexibility does not mean lack of planning. All programs for fifth year should be carefully planned under guidance of competent faculty advisers at a teacher training institution.

5. Each institution should establish a

faculty committee with broad representation from various schools and departments to determine policies regarding the fifth year program.

6. The planned fifth year program for an individual student should be related to

(a) his previous 4 years of education

(b) his personal needs as determined from practical field experience.

II. What do these general principles mean in terms of the actual program?

1. Each department in a teacher training institution must accept responsibility for helping meet the needs of the fifth year student. They must offer courses needed for advanced preparation in each special area.

2. A person who has successfully completed his planned and balanced program should be granted a masters degree.

3. Courses should be available without prerequisite for persons needing them to balance and broaden their planned program.

4. School systems should offer opportunity for recognition and compensation to encourage each teacher to continue and advance as a teacher in his speciality.

Considerable discussion centered around the question as to whether or not a masters degree should be required for a permanent license, which is the present policy of the state licensing commission. Despite some variation in opinion the majority favored the requirement set out in Bulletin 192 that of a masters degree "or its equivalent."

This should not be taken as a firm and clear-cut position. Many factors need detailed discussion.

(a) Should there be a distinction between elementary and high school teachers?

(b) What about admission requirements at various institutions?

(c) How to take care of the student with poor academic record?

(d) How soon can institutions change patterns and provide new courses?

B. Specific problems of the fifth year for the science teacher were considered. The following broad statements were agreed upon:

Recommendations for Content of Fifth Year in Science

#### Elementary School Teacher

Basic Premise: The time to awaken interest of pupils in science is in the elementary grades. Failure to do so has no doubt

grams should be entirely flexible. It should provide opportunity for the student to broaden his cultural background through general education courses and to meet any requirements of the institution.

## **Group II**

### **Mathematics**

#### **PURPOSE.**

The purpose of the mathematics group was to determine the most important principles which should govern a good fifth year program and to translate these into an actual program which would have as its objective the development of a master teacher of secondary mathematics.

#### **MEMBERSHIP.**

The group was composed of professors of mathematics on the college level, instructors of mathematics on the secondary level, a professor of professional education, a chairman of a college mathematics department, the president of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, graduate assistants in mathematics, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Indiana State Teachers Association, and a member of the Teacher Certification and Licensing Commission.

#### **PROCEDURE.**

The controversial concepts concerning the fifth year in teacher education suggested by the steering committee were used as a basis for discussion in the beginning. From this the group moved into an extensive discussion of the principles which should underly the fifth year program and how these principles should be put into practice.

#### **GENERAL PRINCIPLES.**

The mathematics group recommends the following principles:

1. The fifth year program should be broad and flexible enough to meet the needs of particular students with few specific course requirements in either professional education or subject matter areas.
2. The teacher should be encouraged to acquire at least one full year of teaching experience before entering upon the fifth year program; the college or university may prescribe a definite amount of experience for specific courses such as seminars in the teaching of mathematics.
3. The fifth year program should culminate in an advanced degree so as to provide for definite continuity and meet specific objectives. The title of the degree will depend on the college or university offering the program. This degree could appropriately be called the Master of Mathematics Education.
4. A thesis or research project should be optional in the fifth year in mathematics.
5. It is recommended that the Teacher

Certification and Licensing Commission make no specific requirements as to courses but rather give maximum and/or minimum percentages of the total program in each broad area of training.

#### **SUMMARY.**

We have outlined a fifth year program for the development of a master teacher in mathematics. It does not necessarily follow that their program would be desirable for other subject matter areas. Because of the constantly increasing use of mathematics in all fields of endeavor and the ever-expanding mathematical frontiers, the teacher of mathematics must have a broad but clear understanding of the many facets of the subject. For this reason, we believe it imperative to make the following recommendations.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

A. It is recommended that for a permanent certificate in mathematics that:

1. At least 50 per cent of the work be in subject matter (this also includes seminars in subject matter, subject matter laboratories, etc.)
2. Not more than 25 per cent of the work be done in professional courses in education. (Psychology, Measurement, Guidance, Curriculum, Philosophy, School and Community, Theory of Classroom Management, History, and Philosophy of Education.)
3. The remainder be in general education, related subject matter, or in the major subject area.

B. It is recommended that a permanent certificate to teach mathematics should not be issued unless the teacher receiving the certificate has fulfilled the distribution outlined in recommendation A above.

C. It is recommended that professional organizations, teacher education institutions, and administrators investigate the possibility of an in-service seminar for teachers during the first year of training.

D. The group goes on record as supporting the recommendations and conclusions of the previous conferences on the Fifth year in Teacher Education. We feel that the above moves more specifically into the area of mathematics and attempts to put into action previous recommendations.

## **Group III**

### **The Language Arts**

**PURPOSE.** The two-fold purpose of the language arts group was to consider the general principles which should govern a good fifth year program in teacher education and to make specific recommendations in the field of the language arts.

**MEMBERSHIP.** The group included nineteen members, many of whom attended all sessions. In addition, eleven members of a graduate course in English attended one

session. The group was composed of one elementary teacher, three junior high school teachers, one high school teacher, a high school librarian, an elementary school principal, two heads of college English departments, a professor of education, one head of a speech department, an assistant professor of English, two professors of English, an assistant professor of English and journalism, an assistant professor of education, an instructor in a speech department, and a graduate assistant in English.

**PROCEDURE.** The group meetings were devoted to consideration of the general principles which should govern a good fifth year program in teacher education and the formulation of specific recommendations for the language arts. A sub-committee worked out some general principles for the consideration of the whole group.

**SUMMARY.** The following general principles that should govern a good fifth year program in teacher education came from the group:

1. The fifth year program should have goals and pattern, but there should be flexibility within the pattern and counseling to meet the individual needs of the teacher.
2. The fifth year should culminate in a master's degree.
3. It was the consensus of opinion that teaching experiences should be required of individuals entering the fifth year program.
4. The fifth year should provide a balanced program including work in general education, professional education and the field of specialization.
5. In the fifth year program the needs of the teacher should supersede the traditional requirements of the master's degree and departmental requirements.
6. The programs for the elementary and secondary teachers should be articulated.
7. Tests and records of strengths and inadequacies made by the teacher himself and his superiors in his school system should be considered by the counsellor in making recommendations for the individual program.

**RECOMMENDATIONS.** The six specific recommendations made by the language arts group were:

1. A state-wide committee from teacher-training institutions should be set up to counsel and advise the licensing commission and the graduate schools concerned with teacher education.
2. Representatives of the graduate councils of the teacher-training institutions of the state should meet to consider the graduate offerings in the light of teacher needs.
3. Language Arts experiences should be provided for all teachers regardless of subject matter specialty or level. Teacher-training institutions should create courses in reading, writing, speaking and listening for which they do not demand prerequisites but

which are definitely on a graduate level. Courses counted for credit toward the master's degree should be given on the graduate level. Departments should offer courses on the graduate level whenever possible without prerequisites for elementary teachers and non-majors. Although some special courses for these students may be desirable, we believe that such students can and should take courses with majors in the subject matter field.

4. In planning the fifth year greater cognizance should be taken of the research findings in the area of the language arts made by individuals and such groups as the National Council of Teachers of English.

5. In planning the fifth year in the field of the language arts, courses dealing with the problems of developmental reading, mass media, creative writing, children's literature, adolescent literature, dramatics and the like should be offered in addition to those courses usually offered by those departments concerned with the language arts.

6. To further a continued interest in professional advancement the graduate schools should acquaint their students with the professional organizations and publications in their field and urge their affiliation.

## Group IV Social Science

**PURPOSE.** The purposes of the group were to review the Social Science report of the Third Conference on the Fifth year in 1954; and to aid in formulating principles of policy for a fifth year in keeping with the four points in the report of Dr. Batchelder as stated during the first day of the conference.

**MEMBERSHIP.** The group was made up of twenty-two persons including teachers of the social sciences at the high school, college, and university levels; college administrators and registrars; teachers in education departments in college, university, and the teachers colleges; and a vice-president of the Indiana Congress of Parents and Teachers.

**PROCEDURE.** The chairman made the individuals of the group acquainted with each other at the first meeting. He then proposed several plans for proceeding with the discussion. After a preliminary review of the work of the Social Studies Section of 1954, it was agreed that each should study the report carefully, raise questions, and decide whether the 1954 report stated the basic concepts of the social science group in regard to the fifth year.

At the second meeting of the group there was some further discussion of the 1954 proposals. This resulted in the acceptance of the fundamental issues in the report of 1954.

Attention was then directed to the four

points concerning basic policies for the fifth year as suggested by Dr. Batchelder's report at the opening session.

**SUMMARY.** Proposed Statements of Policy:

1. That the licensing Commission specify the master's degree for the conversion of the first class license to a permanent license.

2. Institutions should offer several different avenues for attaining the master's degree.

3. That patterns for the degree be determined by the degree-granting institutions subject to, for the purposes of certification, the approval of the licensing authority.

4. That the content of any master's degree be aimed at the continuing professional growth of the superior teacher with emphasis upon his teaching areas.

Further study in the teaching areas should be of such quality as to increase the depth of the teacher's insight in his specialty and should help him to integrate this insight with those of related areas.

Further study in professional education should deal particularly with fundamental concepts and problems of educational theory and practice; it should require teachers to consider critically the origins and present nature of the choices and issues confronting democratic people.

In the light of these statements of policy, we feel that the fulfillment of the requirements for the administrative certificate is in itself inappropriate preparation for a master teacher.

5. That the state teacher training and licensing commission appoint representatives of the teacher-education institutions of Indiana to serve as a continuing advisory committee to the commission on the fifth year in teacher-education.

6. That the fifth year program should be conceived with the need of the experienced teacher in mind. (At least one year of experience.)

### REASONS FOR SUPPORTING THE MASTER'S DEGREE

1. It is totally unrealistic to assume that the teacher will systematically pursue an improvement program without appropriate terminal recognition as evidence by a degree.

2. We have taken the position in our report that the plan of the master's degree should be determined by the several teacher-education institutions. If an equivalency is recognized, the tendency will be for the state licensing commission to outline the content of this work; and thus circumscribe the responsibility of teacher-education institutions to plan progressively improved programs of teacher education.

3. The requirements of the master's degree offers an effective way of selecting master teachers for the profession. Only those teachers who can meet the quality of the master's teacher's degree should be retained in the profession.

## Group V Practical Arts

**PURPOSE.** To study the previous report on requirements for fifth year training in the practical arts and make further recommendations.

**MEMBERSHIP.** The group was composed of twenty persons including teachers of practical arts at the high school, college and university levels; college administrators and registrars; graduate students; school administrators; professors of education and a representative of the Indiana School Board Association.

**PROCEDURE.** The group took a hurried look through the "Analysis of Outcomes of the Conference on the Fifth Year of Teacher Education" as prepared by Dr. Batchelder and accepted them. It then proceeded with a discussion of the "Controversial Concepts concerning the Fifth Year in Teacher Education."

The principles and policies which should govern a good fifth year program in teacher education in Indiana were drawn up.

**SUMMARY.** There is a great difference in the back ground of teachers. The fifth year must take them from where they are and meet their needs. Vocational agriculture covers a very wide field. It is a father, son, and teacher relationship. Even though it is a broad field the standards should be held high. We must go back to the individual needs of the teacher and we must know what he is going to teach.

The teacher education program must be a continuous fourth year plus the fifth year and it must be kept flexible. The teacher knows best his needs and should have a major part in the choice of how these needs are met. Teachers know some of their weaknesses and needs, but it is going to take counseling to bring out the weaknesses of the teacher.

**RECOMMENDATION.** Principles which should govern fifth year program in teacher education.

1. Since the total preparatory program in teacher education should embody general education, professional education, and specialized education, the current trend toward specialization at the fifth-year level seems justifiable and will probably continue.

2. A good fifth year program should be tailored to meet the needs of the individual as determined cooperatively:

- a. by his needs as he interprets them.
- b. by his needs as interpreted by those who supervise his work.
- c. by his graduate counselor as he interprets them.

It is agreed that the teacher's expression of his needs must be given recognition. A distinction between expressed needs and mere



desires of the teacher is necessary. Any fifth year program tailored to individual needs will be successful only to the extent that the individual can be helped to see his real needs. The importance of a strong counseling program cannot be over-emphasized.

3. It is recognized that each area in practical arts education makes significant contributions to the general education of the learner.

We accept, as necessary, preparation in the teaching area, professional education, and general education as component parts of teacher education. However because of the varied preparation that teachers at the fifth-year level will present, it would seem impractical to designate a proportionate amount for each area. The fifth year might well include some preparation in the three areas designated, but the amounts in each would be determined through analysis of need rather than thorough arbitrary requirements.

4. The State Teachers Training and Licensing Commission should recognize a planned fifth year program of teacher improvement at the graduate level as a basis for permanent certification and the fifth year salary increments.

5. The fifth year should include (Suggested hours):

a. Professionalized subject matter in his field of teaching. (8 Quarter hours or 6 Semester hours)

b. Professionalized education directed toward the mastery of both the art and science of teaching. (8 Quarter hours or 6 Semester hours)

c. Directed electives determined in the light of the students undergraduate background and his present discernible and likely needs. (32 Quarter hours or 18 Semester hours)

Those who have met merely the minimum subject requirements in undergraduate work should be required to take at least 50 percent of his work in his major field.

6. It is strongly recommended that all students should secure teaching experience before completing the fifth year of teacher education.

## Group VI Fine Arts

**PURPOSE.** The purpose of the group was to review the work of the previous conference and to submit recommendations for a fifth year program in the field of fine arts.

**MEMBERSHIP.** The group was composed of fourteen individuals. These persons were teachers of music and art in the elementary schools, secondary schools, and colleges and universities of the state of Indiana. There

was one professor of education in the group.

**PROCEDURE.** Group discussion techniques were used.

**RECOMMENDATIONS.** The ten specific recommendations made by the fine arts group were:

1. The fifth year in Teacher Education in Indiana should enable the teacher to broaden and increase his knowledge in his teaching field(s).

2. It should not require that he increase in number his teaching areas.

3. It should give him the opportunity to broaden his cultural background in areas other than his teaching field(s). To this end all departments or colleges should provide for him adult courses of graduate caliber with, however, prerequisites.

4. Research, problem solving, creative work, and recreative work should be encouraged in the fifth year and are of value especially to the teacher of fine arts.

5. The use of the graduate practicum in the teacher's subject matter area is of primary value in his fifth year. It might well be required.

6. On-the-job experience is essential to the fifth year. A minimum of one year of teaching experience should give added meaning to study and might well be required prior to completion of the work of the fifth year.

7. The program for the fifth year should be quite flexible, but this does not rule out the necessity for a non-rigid frame(s) to be created by the school or the department.

8. The felt needs of the career teacher should receive initial and continued consideration by student and counselor when planning the fifth year. The dignity of the student and his expressed needs are primary.

9. The fifth year student deserves the best counseling aid possible in determining the weaker regions of his teaching competencies.

10. The fifth year should lead to a masters degree without stigma.

## Group VII Foreign Languages

**PURPOSE.** The foreign language group considered its purpose to be, primarily, to carry on the work of the preceding conference and to relate its conclusions as specifically as possible to some of the general problems confronting all teaching areas at the graduate level.

**MEMBERSHIP.** The group was composed of one high school principal, two high school teachers of Latin, one professor of Classical Languages, and one professor of Romance Languages.

**PROCEDURE.** We reviewed carefully the findings and recommendations of the previ-

ous conferences. Since it was found that we were in general agreement about most of the earlier recommendations from the foreign language groups, we felt that it would be most profitable for us to consider the relationship of our problems to those of the other groups, particularly in regard to those matters about which there still seemed to be considerable disagreement as indicated in Dean Batchelder's report.

**SUMMARY.** It seemed to the group that one area in which the foreign language teacher's problems most clearly coincide with those of teachers of other areas is in the matter of providing a graduate program which will be sufficiently varied and flexible to meet the needs of the individual teacher and which will at the same time meet certification requirements for a permanent license. It was the unanimous opinion of the group that the solution of this problem hinged to a great extent upon the question of whether or not a satisfactory fifth year program must necessarily involve meeting requirements for a master's degree.

As we began to list the needs of teachers seeking additional training in foreign languages, we soon realized that many of these needs were for types of courses that would not be recognized as graduate work by most reputable graduate institutions: e.g. "refresher" courses in conversation, in grammar and composition; instruction in the use of audio-visual aids and other teaching devices; elementary courses that might form part of a summer travel program in a foreign country, etc. We were also concerned for the growing need for teachers of foreign language in the elementary grades, realizing that this would require the adaption of the foreign language knowledge of many of the present elementary teachers to the classroom needs at the elementary level. Much of this knowledge, while it might be made adequate for the limited use to which it would be put at the elementary level, is far from adequate to serve as the basis for graduate study leading to an advanced degree in foreign languages.

For this reason, it seemed to members of our group that any adequate fifth year program, if it were to be sufficiently flexible and varied to meet the needs of all foreign language teachers, must, as a basis for teacher certification, be divorced from the necessity of obtaining a master's degree. We believe that if the master's degree is to be maintained as a truly "advanced" degree, then we should not confuse the requirements for advanced study with the diversified needs of the classroom teacher for additional specialized training to supplement his or her present knowledge. We would emphasize our conviction that the satisfaction of these, as a basis for teacher certification, is equally as important as advanced study leading to a master's degree, but that to confuse these two objectives would ultimate-

ly destroy all validity of the master's degree as an *advanced academic degree*.

As we began to see more clearly our own problems in relation to this question of whether or not a master's degree should be required of all classroom teachers (we were concerned primarily with the classroom teacher, as we felt that the master's degree requirement for administrative licenses was probably open to no serious objection.), we asked ourselves whether these problems were peculiar to foreign language teachers. It seemed to the members of our group that quite the contrary is true: viz., teachers in nearly every area have individual needs arising for additional study and training to round out their previous training, but these needs are often for *elementary* courses in allied or other fields. Many examples were presented, but a few will serve as illustrations. A music teacher often needs to learn to play an additional instrument; a band teacher needs instruction in baton-twirling and marching techniques or in re-stringing of musical instruments. Elementary teachers need and desire subject-matter courses at the sophomore or junior level in, for example, mathematics, history or the sciences. Secondary teachers will often need additional work in their restricted area or for preparing an additional teaching field. In view of these facts, the needs of foreign language teachers in this matter, therefore, did not seem to be essentially different from those of teachers of other fields.

As there has been much disagreement concerning this question of requiring a master's degree for permanent certification, this group examined various objections that might be raised to our position in this matter. What harm might result if a non-degree fifth year program were also recognized as a valid basis for teacher certification?

Such objections as "the lowering of standards" for teachers, the loss of "prestige", etc., which are sometimes raised, seem to the group not to be valid. We did not feel that it is "lowering standards", when judged in the light of effective teaching, to try to meet the individual needs of the classroom teacher in his particular job. In this connection, the group felt that it should be pointed out that undergraduate courses are not of inferior quality to graduate courses, and that an undergraduate course pertinently related to a particular teacher's needs may very well result in a higher standard of teaching than an unrelated graduate course that is academically on a "higher" level. The group further believes that there is a growing realization that, in the past, too much importance has been attached to purely formal labels, such as degrees, and too little attention to the actual value of studies pursued.

The most serious danger, in the opinion of the group, which a non-degree program might encounter is that there might result in a hodge-podge of unrelated courses. We

would recommend therefore that such a program be implemented with an adequate advising system at the graduate level. It would also require some sort of control and evaluation, leading to a certificate of professional training as a basis for recommendation for the granting of a permanent license.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

The group agreed upon the following recommendations:

1. That the scope of the fifth year program be broad enough to include a wide range of objectives, including the present Masters degree programs as well as courses specifically related to the professional and academic needs of the individual teacher, which might or might culminate in a masters degree.

2. That all possible safeguards be used to maintain a high quality of work in the fifth year program.

3. That articles 1, 3, and 10 of the Dr. Batchelder's report (first page) be given special emphasis in a statement of principles. The group also wishes to recommend that Articles 4, 5, and 6 be condensed and incorporated into a single general principle that a fifth year program should provide opportunity for the teacher to consider the problems of teaching in relationship to such things as, a democratic society, to world problems, to the needs of the individual child, to theories of education, etc., so as to enable him to formulate his own philosophy of education.

4. The group feels that these principles would naturally be represented in a well balanced program, covering not just the fifth year, but all five years, and would include the three main elements of: general education, field of specialization, and professional education. In the fifth year there should be sufficient flexibility, however, to allow for a high degree of concentration in the field of specialization. We believe this to be particularly true in the field of foreign languages where adequate mastery of the language requires a high degree of concentration in the subject matter area.

### Group VIII Physical Education

**PURPOSE.** The physical education group endeavor to review the work of the previous study groups by interpreting their findings and recommendations in the light of the understandings of the present committee and setting forth general guiding principles relative to the fifth year program.

**MEMBERSHIP.** The group was made up of two women, one a student and one a teacher of physical education in a teacher education institution. Two other members were from institutions offering advanced degrees in physical education on the graduate

level. Another who attended part time was a college coach. Several were high school teachers with less than five years of experience. The other members of the group were students. In all there were fourteen members.

**PROCEDURE.** The physical education group endeavored to identify the unique problems relative to its area. And also to accept the suggested topics set forth by the steering committee.

**SUMMARY.** The following problems were discussed:

1. What is the fifth year of teacher education?

The discussion centered around the reasons for and the competencies expected at the end of the fifth year.

The group understood that the fifth year program was designed to bring about better teachers rather than administrators.

2. What are some general guiding principles relative to the fifth year program?

After reviewing the work of previous committees the following principles were accepted:

- a. The fifth year program should be characterized by flexibility to such a degree that provision for meeting the needs of individuals, as determined by various means, including the suggestions of the student, should be included.

- b. The fifth year program should provide a score of common understandings. Knowledge and skills which will make for efficient teachers. This core would apply to all teachers, regardless of level on subject matter area.

- c. Experience should precede and accompany the fifth year.

- d. The primary emphasis on research in the fifth year program should be toward understanding and utilization of research.

- e. The fifth year should culminate in a recognized degree and for want of a better term be called a Masters Degree.

**RECOMMENDATIONS.** These recommendations are, to a large extent, the same or modification of those, made by the Physical Education Group of the 1954 Conference. The others represent, in the main, the consensus of group thinking when the problem was discussed. The recommendations follow:

1. The graduate fifth year should require a minimum of 30 semester hours.

2. There is a need for more liberal or general education on the part of teachers in physical education.

3. Undergraduate deficiencies in a major field are to be made up in addition to graduate requirements.

4. Greater emphasis is needed upon guidance service in determining objectively the fifth-year course needs in addition to expressed needs of the teachers.

5. The fifth year should be tailored more to suit the unique needs of each teacher.

6. Student advising should be accomp-



lished by competent counselors in the students area of specialization.

7. More adequate records, tests, and requests from schools and employers are essential to this process and should be available in advance of guidance.

8. There might be more concern in determining the extent to which the fifth year should serve the citizenship, cultural, master teaching, scholarship, administration, and research objectives.

9. Experience should precede and accompany graduate education.

10. Graduate courses must be taken in institutions accredited for graduate work in the respective field.

11. State departments should be more concerned with the standards of institutions offering work in teacher education.

12. The course should include both health and physical education to conform to the similar comprehensive area.

13. Graduate faculty should have adequate education.

14. Extra-class duties of graduate faculty should be considered.

15. A committee be formed from professional persons in institutions offering graduate courses in this area to study curriculum and other problems of the fifth year program for the purpose of making recommendations to the Division of Teacher Training and Licensing of the Indiana Department of Public Instruction.

## Group IX Elementary Grades

**PURPOSE.** The purpose of the elementary group was to discuss the needs of teachers for a fifth year in teacher education and to suggest policies and procedures by which

colleges and universities may meet these needs.

**MEMBERSHIP.** The group was composed of eight elementary teachers, one elementary principal, one elementary and junior high school principal, one graduate student, one librarian, three directors of teacher education and one head of the education department, five in departments of education, three teachers of special education, one coordinator of graduate students, one student advisor, one registrar and student advisor, one college dean, one college supervisor, the state PTA president, the director of certification, two members of teacher training and licensing commission, and one director of elementary education.

**PROCEDURE.** The sessions started with discussions by the entire group and reports from members of state commissions and committees. This group divided into three smaller groups with leaders and recorders for discussions of specific topics. The entire group met for reports from the smaller groups and further discussions.

These two problems seem to include the detailed discussion:

1. The development of a list of principles applicable to the program of preparation of elementary teachers.

The following principles were accepted by the group:

Basic Principles Underlying the Five-year Program for the Education of Elementary Teachers.

1. The program should be flexible enough to provide for the needs of the individual student; but there should be a framework within which the program should be organized.

2. The program should develop those competencies that are considered essential to the teacher to enable her to be a superior professional worker.

3. The program should be based on the student's needs, interests, and purposes as determined by her and by those working with her. (Counselors, supervisors, principles, etc.)

4. The program should be developed as a five year unit with teaching experience being recommended prior to the fifth year.

5. The five-year program should culminate in a master's degree.

6. It is desirable that the completion of the five-year program in teacher education should not necessarily conclude the person's professional interests and extended study.

II. Implementation to put the preceding principles into action.

This particular phase of the work was extremely timely in view of the fact that a special committee has already been appointed by the state commission on teacher training and certification, the purpose of which is to revise the current curriculum for the preparation of elementary teachers. Members of this group helped in formulating the following points.

**RECOMMENDATIONS.** The last year of the five year program, culminating in the masters degree, should be a balanced program consisting of three blocks of work each of which contributes to the development of competencies in teaching. These three blocks should consist of:

1. A common core designed to develop understandings, skills, and attitudes essential to critical evaluation of all professional endeavor in terms of the real functions of education in democratic society.

2. Selected professional courses, designed to improve teaching in the elementary school, with special emphasis on child development, curriculum development, methods of instruction, and evaluation.

3. Guided electives to meet individual needs and special interests.

## Conference Summary

WALTER COOK

I have found this to be a very stimulating and well-organized conference and you seem to have "pin-pointed" your job well. All of you were very much on the ball and each group was making progress.

Since this is to be your last such conference it is probably important to solve the problem now and for all time to come. I would suggest that steps be taken, probably by the state Teachers Training and Licensing Commission, to bring together from time to time those concerned with the problems involved.

If you will evaluate your programs as people go through you will see that they lack

flexibility. Even though you think that you have a flexible program you will find that the adviser often makes it into a very rigid one.

To get flexibility in these programs, you will have to force it. But it will come after you have looked at the actual programs people have completed when they graduate. At that time we are going to be very disappointed with the rigidity with which their advisors enforced what they think, in their empire building attitudes, is an ideal program. You are going to need to review this. I also like the idea of the various subject matter areas getting together. I think you

have an excellent division there, and in every institution you will find men in their various departments who have the old liberal arts point of view regarding a traditional liberal arts program being the best for teacher education. Those people need to get some experience in teaching elementary pupils or high school pupils. In other words, that is one of the quickest ways of changing their attitudes. But since that can't be done, at least if you can bring them together every so often with good practical teachers. They will begin to get the teachers point of view and to see the teaching job in a new light. I like to think that these conferences will continue. But there may be workshops at which unregenerated college teachers have a chance to "rub elbows" with the practical teachers and find out what it takes to teach in the elementary and secondary schools.



I felt that the situation which you are dealing with here is that of certification requirements: that after ten years a teacher who continues to teach must have a master's degree. I like to commend you for this foresightedness, however, I don't think I would recommend that such a law be passed. One reason I feel that way is because it would be possible for a teacher to teach nine years, then drop out and take a masters degree, and that would be just the wrong way to do it. Graduate work is most valuable after one, two, or three years of experience, when the teacher is still flexible. Professor Hullfish talked about this, the importance of keeping the new teacher from falling back into the habit patterns which are very frequently recommended by their fellow teachers. It is during these first years that graduate work is most valuable to them and when they need the greatest help. So I would prefer that they complete a minimum of fifteen semester hours by the end of the first five years. Preferably, I would like to have them have the masters degree by the end of the first five years. I don't object to the Masters Degree by tenth year, but I would like to have at least half of it to come in the first five years. I don't believe in life certificates anyway. I think a certificate should have to be renewed every five years with some evidence of graduate work even after they have taught fifteen or even twenty years. To keep continually alive should be a part of the certification program. I am sure you all know people who have life certificates who shouldn't have them.

I emphasized in my first talk to you, selective admission and selective retentions that have been dealt with by many of the committees, although I don't think it will be a part of the final report. You would think it obvious that personnel folders should be made up for these candidates for masters degrees during their first quarter or semester in your schools. You would think that would go without saying, and that you should have their undergraduate record and their general level of academic ability, their ability in the communicative arts, their achievement in mathematics (although you might want to rule that out) and their general background in education—that is how well they can apply the principles which they have and find on the undergraduate level; and this personality measure, or at least personality measures. I know this practice is reasonable, but unless somebody takes responsibility for that in each of your institutions and pushes it through, it just won't happen.

I think you have a B average in most of your schools, and you require a B average for graduation. We are kidding ourselves when we set up such a requirement. We have it in Minnesota too which means that when you are teaching graduate students, that if

you give them a C, you are almost saying that is a flunk. Therefore, you give about maybe 20 or 25 percent A's. Some people give no C's but the most you will find will be 15 or 16 C's. Very rarely will you find a D or an F; that is really slapping them in the face! If you set a B average, then all the professors give people B's; if you set an A average, everybody would get an A. So you are kidding yourselves a little bit. But you will have to watch visiting professors who come from other institutions where they tend to get the normal undergraduate distribution of grades. We had some visiting professors at Minnesota who give C's or less to two-thirds of the class and that is rather embarrassing when you are maintaining a B average. I am just telling you some of the peculiar things we do as graduate professors that are a little silly. What I am going to say is, if you want to find out whether these scores that you get on these tests will predict what the students do in classes then you will have to get the teacher of the class, to rank his students from the best to the poorest and use that as the basis of your correlation of your study. You can't do it with A and B grades. There is not enough distribution of grades of graduate students so that you can evaluate your predictive instruments. But if you will get these ranks in the large classes and correlate those with these predictive devices, you will find correlations as high as 60-85. (sometimes so high you almost feel that the grades were distributed on the basis of academic aptitude rather than on achievement in the course).

Now, the next ten years, are going to be years when you are going to want to put almost everyone through your courses, so that is an excellent time to evaluate the scores that you get on the beginning students, to find out whether they predict anything. You have to do that at a time when almost everyone is going through. But ten years from now your enrollment is going to be so great that you will have to select, and you had better find out how to do it during these ten years now when everyone is going through so that when you have to select you will have done the research and have the information on which to select intelligently. You will have the evidence during the next ten years to do the job following that.

I said that the only way to improve teachers is to improve the type of students you have and the caliber of the college teachers. Now, I feel that most colleges could do more in identifying potential college teachers at the undergraduate level. That is, you have some remarkably talented youngsters going through your colleges at the undergraduate level. They ought to be identified as potential college teachers at that time. They should be encouraged to do certain types of

graduate work, to go into certain areas where they are needed. We never have enough graduate students to supply the demand at the college level. If the colleges would identify these potential college teachers when they are undergraduates and guide them, then you would have a more competent faculty. If you wait for people to do graduate work, rather than to tell them very early that they should do graduate work, then you get an entirely different group; that is, there are too many people who come for advanced graduate work who shouldn't, and there are probably five times that many who are still back teaching who should be doing graduate work but nobody has identified them and told them so. So that you have a responsibility for advising your top 25 percent as they go through their undergraduate years and painting a picture of what they can do in teacher education if they get the right preparation. I like the emphasis you've put on practical "on the job" experience before completing the masters degree. That is very important. I like the emphasis you placed on a balanced, flexible program, but I warn you again that the only way you will get that, is to become rigid. You say no more than so many credits in the major, and you must also say not less than so many hours in the second area and in the third area. If you don't, there won't be any third area. I am telling you this from experience. If you want a broad program you will have to enforce it. And of course, I think it goes without saying, that if you have a program such as you have had in mind here, that it should culminate in a masters degree. We know that there are so many kinds of masters degrees now and they haven't meant too much even from the larger universities and the best graduate schools. They haven't meant too much in the last twenty or twenty-five years. You simply can't resist the current which says that a masters degree, follows such a program, they will go somewhere where they can get a masters degree. I feel that in every institution there should be a committee which might be called an executive committee of the fifth year, or whether you want to call it. But here must be a committee that looks over all the programs as soon as we know what the complete program for a student will be. You can't determine in the beginning because there will be too many conflicts. If you approve the program at the beginning it will constantly have to be changed because of conflicts and certain courses not being offered when this person can take it; so that you have to wait until they approach the last quarter, then the program is complete and then he should go to the committee which looks them over to see whether the three areas (maybe four) have been dealt with, but at least three, but it is flexible and broad. Then this same committee will appoint the examining committee to examine the candidate.

I don't like to emphasize too much research in connection with this, but I feel that there should be some papers dealing with the practical problems of the teacher, which will be reviewed by the examining committee. I would say you could either set them up as long term papers in certain courses where you have a person willing to do that, or you could set them up as individual research courses in which they must complete a paper. It is not a master's thesis, but it gives the teacher an opportunity to work off about six credits while they are on the job, by doing research in some of the problems of the local schools. It is unfortunate that there is so much research done and to be done, yet the teachers can't read it. I don't expect them to go beyond, say understanding a coefficient of correlation and significance of differences; maybe that would be far enough at the masters level. But at least they should go that far. It is rather serious, because if you send an article to a Journal, read by teachers, that has any technical material in it at all, it is rejected. We have a profession which cannot read the technical literature, and we are furthering that tendency when we do not deal with it at least at the masters level. We require a course in statistics in our elementary program at the lower level. That is, it is statistics, individual differences, and measurements combined integrated. We can't emphasize too much the importance of the type of teacher who teaches in this program at the college level. They should be sympathetic with the problems of the elementary and secondary teacher (if they are not), the quickest way of finding out is whether they really like to teach what they are teaching. (I mean the professor.) It is tremendously important that we permit good teachers to build large classes, and if they are not so good let it be obvious.

One other point then I will close. Sometimes we worry too much about whether we are going to have seniors and graduate students in the same classes. I have had that situation in Minnesota for many years. In mathematics and in physics and chemistry, systematic disciplines, and foreign language, that is rather important. But in our fields I find these undergraduates frequently outshine the graduate students. You can do better with a good group of seniors than you do with the graduate students. And the poorest classes you have are in the summer. We must remember that in the first grade the range of ability is four years. Almost any test you give the first grade there is a four year range in vocabulary, intelligence, reading readiness, or what-not. In the sixth grade the range is eight years. Whether you measure English, science, mathematics, any measure you give, the range is eight years in the sixth grade class. In high school

the range is ten years. The range of reading ability in the ninth grade is ten years. Now that is not just select schools, that is any schools. You need to know you could take the upper 10 percent of your high school class and give them Bachelors Degrees, without lowering the status of the Bachelors Degree in the least, or without lowering the intellectual competencies of your people with Bachelors Degrees. The upper 10 percent of your high school class already knows more American history than the average college graduate. They already know more mathematics than the average college graduate. They already can write better compositions than the average college graduate, and so forth. The lower 10 percent of the A's have less intellectual competency or have the same intellectual competencies as the average high school graduate. You are dealing with tremendous differences. I sometimes laugh at my friends in psychology who say that psychology can be taught to sophomores in college, but not to freshmen. I remind you of these facts. Of course, I am not recommending that we give the A's to the upper 10 percent of the high school students, because they are the people who profit most from college. Degrees are not made to make people equal, but we have to realize that whenever we put people through high school. For example, they are more different, they are more unlike when they graduate than they were when they entered or if they hadn't entered at all. With your first four years of teacher education, their ability to teach is wider apart than if you hadn't sent them to school at all. Certain people profit greatly from what you do, and others profit very little. So don't worry too much about that Degree, with the possible exception of the Ph.D., it never has meant too much in the way of teaching intellectual competency. And it is not likely to improve in that regard. I know some Ph.D.'s in some jobs that I would rather have a good high school graduate doing. So our job is to improve teaching, and everything else is subsidiary.

#### GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The following summary, compiled by a conference committee composed of Howard T. Batchelder, Norman T. Pratt, Jr., Donald M. Sharpe, and Velma Sherry, was presented at the last session of the conference. The report was adopted for publication as the Steering Committee sees fit.

The Fourth state-wide Conference on The Fifth Year in Teacher Education drawing from the ideas developed in the preceding three conferences on this subject, has reached

the following conclusions concerning general principles to guide the development of the fifth-year program for teacher education in Indiana. The detailed recommendations of the various study-groups are contained in the individual reports.

I. The fifth year program in teacher education must be flexible to meet the particular needs of the individual student taking into consideration his experience, interests, previous academic training. The goal is the development of the teacher as a professional person. Competent counseling and planning should provide a balance between general education, field of specialization and professional education as the end result of the total five year experience.

II. The successful completion of a planned fifth year program should lead to a masters degree. (One group felt that a non-degree program would permit more adequate attention to the specific needs of individual teachers.)

III. The design of the fifth year program should provide for:

A. The opportunity to explore new fields.

B. Continued study of fundamental problems in professional education especially the role of the school in society and the nature of human development.

C. Emphasis upon continued growth in the teaching areas.

IV. Within this pattern described above, each institution should be given considerable latitude in developing its own fifth year program. It is recognized that there are other avenues leading to the master's degree.

V. There should be a minimum of one year of teaching experience before completing the fifth year program.

VI. Completion of the fifth year program should not be construed as the termination of formal education.

VII. Each department in a teacher education institution should accept responsibility for helping meet the needs of the fifth year student by designing and offering courses for such students even though they have had little or no previous experience in the subject.

VIII. Since the administration of the fifth year program in teacher education will require continuing thought and review, provision should be made for periodic consultation between the teacher education institutions and the Commission on Teacher Education Training and Licensing.



# Directory of Participants

Jewel E. Ahrens, Librarian, Honey Creek High School, Terre Haute, Indiana.

C. E. Aldrich, Director, Graduate Division and Head, Modern Foreign Languages, Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Cloyd Anthony, Professor of Social Studies, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Bonnie Barrick, Associate Professor, Home Economics, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Norma Barth, Physical Education Teacher, Kendallville, Indiana.

James R. Bash, Associate Professor of English, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Howard T. Batchelder, Associate Dean, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Joseph Bauer, Jr., Track Coach, Industrial Arts Teacher, Winamac High School, Winamac, Indiana.

Burley V. Bechdolt, Director of Research, Indiana State Teachers Association, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Thelma C. Bird, Teaching Materials Librarian, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Burniece L. Black, Elementary Principal, Sunnyside School, New Castle, Indiana.

John V. Blackwell, Assistant Professor of Arts, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana.

Mary L. Blake, Elementary Teacher, Tuttle School, Crawfordsville, Indiana.

Howard A. Book, Director of Teacher Education, North Manchester, Indiana.

John A. Boyd, Assistant Professor of Journalism and English, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

James R. Boyle, Instructor in Speech, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Edward H. Buehrig, Professor, Department of Government, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

John A. Buelke, Professor of Education, Western Michigan College, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Galen W. Bull, Assistant Professor of Science, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Richard W. Burkhardt, Dean of the College, Muncie, Indiana.

Carmen B. Carlos, Graduate Student, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana.

L. N. Carmichael, Vocational Agriculture Teacher, Trafalgar, Indiana.

Merrill Carr, Science and Mathematics Teachers, Fayette Township Schools, New Goshen, Indiana.

Martha Rebecca Carter, Director of Art, South Bend, Indiana.

Majorie E. Causey, Assistant Professor of

Education, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Margaret Champlin, Elementary Sight-Saving Teacher, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Marvin Chappelow, Elementary Teacher, McKinley School, Logansport, Indiana.

Emma Kennedy Chatters, Teacher, Carver Elementary School, Gary, Indiana.

William R. Cheever, Elementary and Junior High Principle, Miami School, Miami, Indiana.

Alfred Stafford Clayton, Professor of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

J. E. Cobb, Professor of Education, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Walter W. Cook, Dean of College of Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Dan H. Cooper, Director, Division of Education, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Robert Earl Cramer, Dean and Registrar, Indiana Central College, Indianapolis 3, Indiana.

William F. Cunningham, C. S. C., Professor of Education, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.

Florence M. Curtis, Head, Dept. of Physical Education for Women, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Harriet Darrow, Elementary Teacher, Laboratory School, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Edwin Day, Graduate Student, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Harry C. Day, Professor of Chemistry, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Mark E. Dean, Assistant Professor of Physical Education, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Elizabeth S. Dowdy, Teacher, Jonesboro Elementary School, Greensboro, North Carolina.

Lewis C. Dowdy, Director of Student Teaching, The Agricultural and Technical College, Greensboro, North Carolina.

Maxine M. Dunfee, Associate Professor of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Helen Ederle, Associate Professor of Education, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Paul Darius Egli, Band Director, Brook High School, Brook, Indiana.

Shirley H. Engle, Associate Professor of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Katherine Rebekah Everman, Supervisor of Elementary Music, Anderson City Schools, Anderson, Indiana.

Gertrude Ewing, Associate Professor of

Latin, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Louise Follick, Primary Teacher Durgan School, Lafayette, Indiana.

Virginia Ann Foster, Elementary Teacher, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Beulah V. Gillaspie, Dean, School of Home Economics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Clinton C. Green, Head, Education Department, DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana.

Joseph A. Gremelspacher, Director of Bands, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Sarah I. M. Hagerman, Elementary Teacher, Michigan City, Indiana.

Rex E. Harvey, Chairman Mathematics Department, Elkhart High School, Elkhart, Indiana.

Mrs. Graydon Heuman, President, Indiana Congress of Parents and Teachers, Muncie, Indiana.

Arthur D. Hill, Chairman, Music Department, Terre Haute, Indiana.

John Francis Hollingsed, Intermediate Teacher, Chicago Heights, Illinois.

Raleigh W. Holmstedt, President, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Ernest W. Horn, Head, Social Studies Department, Bloomington High School, Bloomington, Indiana.

H. Gordon Hullfish, Professor of Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Ray E. Hunter, Elementary Supervisor, Vigo County Schools, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Hilmer E. Jacobson, Director of Choral Music, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Olis G. Jamison, Chairman, Education Department, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

William C. Jardine, Principal, Henry Reis Elementary School, Evansville, Indiana.

H. A. Jeep, Professor of Education, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana.

Earl A. Johnson, Head, Department of Education, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana.

Mildred I. Johnston, Special Education, Lawrence Township School, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Betty M. Kanable, Associate Professor of Music, Evansville College, Evansville, Indiana.

Robert L. Kellems, Graduate Student, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

M. Wiles Keller, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

William G. Kessel, Assistant Professor of Chemistry, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Curtis D. Kirklin, Director of Teacher Education, Franklin College, Franklin, Indiana.



G. David Koch, Chairman, Department of Science, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Milton E. Kraft, Professor of Education, Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana.

Hilda Kreft, Head of Home Economics, Arsenal Technical High School, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Helen Kuntz, Elementary Teacher, James Monroe School, South Bend, Indiana.

Robert LaFollette, Head, Social Studies Department, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana.

Mark Robert LaGrange, Physical Education and Mathematics Teacher, Ferdinand High School, Ferdinand, Indiana.

Victor B. Lawhead, Associate Professor of Education, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana.

Merritt E. Lawlis, Assistant Professor of English, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Clayton G. Lawrence, Director of Teacher Education, Marion College, Marion, Indiana.

C. H. Lawshe, Assistant Dean, Graduate School, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

B. C. Lawson, Executive Assistant, Division of Education, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Ward A. Lear, Graduate Student, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Anne M. Lee, Head, Department of Home Economics, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Newell H. Long, Associate Professor of Music, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Margaret E. Luke, English Chairman, North Side Junior High School, Elkhart, Indiana.

Mary R. McBeth, Professor of English, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Lloyd E. McCann, Associate Professor of Education, Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Russell P. McDougal, Director of Audio-Visual Education, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Muriel G. McFarland, Professor of Home Economics, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

Marion A. McGhehey, Executive Secretary, Indiana School Boards Association, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Gladys Swan Mallett, Home Economics Teacher, Plainville High School, Plainville, Indiana.

Charles Edward Marlin, Teacher of Commerce, Reitz High School, Evansville, Indiana.

Charles E. Maudlin, Jr., Graduate Assistant, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Rev. Xavier Maudlin, Registrar, St. Meinrad Seminary, St. Meinrad, Indiana.

Mrs. Leonard H. Miller, First Vice-President, Indiana Congress of Parents and Teachers, Boonville, Indiana.

Vesper D. Moore, Professor of Mathematics, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Dale Morehead, Teacher of English, Tipton High School, Tipton, Indiana.

Benjamin Moulton, Head, Department of Geography, Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Helen Mowrey, Principal, Sunnyside Sanatorium, School, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Leo C. Muller, Public Relations Director, Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus, Miss.

Paul F. Muse, Chairman, Department of Commerce, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Virginia Rolinson Myers, English Department, Gerstmeyer Technical High School, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Bernadine C. Nonte, Director of Elementary Education, LaPorte Public Schools, LaPorte, Indiana.

Clifford O'Brien, Industrial Arts Teacher, Fort Wayne Central School, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Mary E. Ohm, Chairman, English Department, Woodrow Wilson Junior High School, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Gertrude J. Oppelt, Chairman, Department of Foreign Language, South Side High School, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Kenneth Orr, Instructor, Special Education Department, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

J. A. Payne, Dean, Barber-Scotia College, Concord, North Carolina.

Philip Peak, Assistant Dean, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

J. B. Peterson, Head, Agronomy Department, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

D. C. Pfendler, Assistant to the Dean, School of Agriculture, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Gene David Phillips, Chairman and Professor of Education, Bethany College, Bethany, West Virginia.

Donald Pound, Assistant Professor of Trades and Industries, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Norman T. Pratt, Jr., Chairman, Department of Classics, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Borden R. Purcell, Director of Professional Relations, Indiana State Teachers Association, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Leon Purcell, Social Studies Teacher, Honey Creek High School, Terre Haute, Indiana.

William E. Purcell, Supt., Vigo County Schools, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Ethel M. Ray, Social Studies Teacher, McLean Junior High School, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Velora Reynolds, Elementary Teacher,

McKeen School, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Clarence E. Robbins, Superintendent, City Schools, Vincennes, Indiana.

Glade E. Rohrer, Industrial Arts Teacher, Wakarusa, Indiana.

Harold T. Ross, Head, Speech Department, DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana.

Stanley Dean Ross, Head, Industrial Arts Department, East Whittier Schools, Whittier, California.

Paul Royalty, Head of English Department, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana.

Ruth J. Runke, Associate Professor of Education, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

John C. Sanders, Graduate Assistant, English Department, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Donald B. Scheick, Associate Professor of Social Studies, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Virgil E. Schooler, Assistant Director of Student Teaching, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Dana B. Schwanholt, Professor of Education, Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Indiana.

Wayne E. Schomer, Director of Placement, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Robert D. Seltzer, Associate Professor of Government, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Clint C. Sexton, Principal, Brazil High School, Brazil, Indiana.

Donald M. Sharpe, Director, Secondary Professional Laboratory Experiences, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Velma Sherry, Elementary Teacher, Garfield School, Muncie, Indiana.

Harold E. Shigley, Associate Professor of Education, Marion College, Marion, Indiana.

Donald S. Shondell, Teacher, Brook High School, Brook, Indiana.

W. O. Shriner, Chairman, Department of Mathematics, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Sister Celeste, Registrar and Student Adviser, Saint Mary-Mary-of-the-Woods College, Saint Mary-of-the-Woods, Indiana.

Sister M. Edith, Supervisor, St. Francis College, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Sister M. Frederica Dudine, O.S.B., Principal, St. Ferdinand High School, Ferdinand, Indiana.

Sister M. Innocentia Kempf, O.S.B., Registrar, St. Benedicts College, Ferdinand, Indiana.

Sister M. Priscilla Mandabach, O.B.S., Principal, Academy Immaculate Conception, Ferdinand, Indiana.

Sister M. Rosanna, Dean, Saint Francis College, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Sister Mary Alice Schnur, O.B.E., Teacher, St. Meinrad School, St. Meinrad, Indiana.

Sister Mary Ruth, Head of Science Department, Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College, Saint Mary-of-the-Woods, Indiana.

Dwain E. Small, Instructor in Mathematics, Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois.

Joseph E. Smith, Teacher, Benedict College, Columbia, South Carolina.

Lloyd N. Smith, Professor of Education, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Myrtle E. Smith, Instructor, Elementary Education, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

George E. Smock, Head of English Department, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Thomas R. Sparks, Drafting Instructor, Senior High School, Michigan City, Indiana.

Lola Stewart, Biology Teacher, Hobart High School, Hobart, Indiana.

Orvel E. Strong, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Fred Swalls, Professor of Education, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Dorothea Tucker Swander, Assistant Professor of Art, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Margaret Sweeney, English Instructor, Guidance Director, Jeffersonville High School, Jeffersonville, Indiana.

Ruth Shiloh Swisher, Primary Teacher, Washington School, Danville, Illinois.

Edgar M. Tanruther, Director, Elementary Professional Laboratory Experiences, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Vilmer L. Tatlock, Director of Extended Services, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Harry S. Taush, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Columbia College, Columbia South Carolina.

James Eugene Thompkins, Principal, Third Avenue School, Evansville, Indiana.

Helen M. Thumm, Nursing Education, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.

Ralph N. Tirey, President Emeritus, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Galvin L. Walker, Associate Professor of Education, Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Mary Catherine Webb, Elementary Teacher, Michigan City, Indiana.

Gordon Luraine West, Teacher Education, St. Augustine's College, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Byron L. Westfall, Professor of Education, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

R. M. Whaley, Professor of Physics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

H. M. Whisler, Director of Teacher Certification, State Department of Public Instruction, Indianapolis, Indianapolis.

Janet M. Wickersham, Elementary Teacher, Nicholson School, Richmond, Indiana.

Marie S. Wilcox, Head, Mathematics Department, Howe High School, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Frances Williams, Assistant Professor of English, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Robert Wyatt, Executive Secretary, Indiana State Teachers Association, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Sylvan A. Yager, Chairman, Department of Industrial Education, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Lutie Young, Mathematics Teacher, Wabash High School, Wabash, Indiana.